DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 643 SO 006 270

AUTHOR	Bredamas, John; And Others
TITLE	International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects. Selected Readings to Supplement H. R. 14643. House Document Number 527.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	Oct 66
NOTE	576p.; Out of Print from Superintendent of Documents; Readings to supplement H. R. 14643; Prepared by the House Task Force on International Education
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$19.74
DESCRIPTORS	Area Studies; Bibliographies; *Cross Cultural Studies; Curriculum Development; Educational Improvement; Educational Legislation; Exchange Programs; Federal Legislation; *Foreign Culture; Foreign Relations; Foreign Students; Government Publications; Higher Education; Institutional Role; *International Education; *Student Exchange Programs; Study Abroad; *World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS	*International Education Act of 1963

ABSTRACT

A selection of important readings from the existing literature in the field of international education is brought together in this volume, printed to serve as a guide for members of the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Congress in understanding the tasks for which the International Education Act of 1963, H. R. 14643, gives support. It is characterized as a comprehensive and substantive compilation of searching and instructive treatises on a broad spectrum of problems and issues in international education. In its consideration of the Act, the Task Force on International Education focused on the development of the capacity of our own institutions of higher education to reach and conduct research about foreign lands and world problems. The readings are organized under the following topic headings: higher education and world affairs; internationalizing the curriculum; educational exchanges; education for development; organizing for international education; and international education. A bibliography lists books, conference reports, papers, speeches, and journal articles in the categories of higher education and world affairs, curriculum educational exchanges, US oversea activities, cooperative educational efforts, and resource materials. (Author/KSM)

ED 087643

50

9th Congress, 2d Se

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

use Document No. 527

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: PAST, PRESENT, PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

SELECTED READINGS TO SUPPLEMENT H.R. 14643

PREPARED BY THE

TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 1966

Printed for use of the House Committee on Education and Labor

ADAM C. POWELL, *Chairman*

SO 006270

89th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - House Document No. 527

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: PAST, PRESENT, PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

SELECTED READINGS TO SUPPLEMENT H.R. 14643

PREPARED BY THE

TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 1966

Printed for use of the House Committee on Education and Labor

ADAM C. POWELL, *Chairman*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
70-264 O WASHINGTON : 1966

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $1.75

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

ADAM C. POWELL, New York, *Chairman*

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky
EDITH GREEN, Oregon
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
ELMER J. HOLLAND, Pennsylvania
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
RALPH J. SCOTT, North Carolina
HUGH L. CAREY, New York
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
CARLTON R. SICKLES, Maryland
SAM GIBBONS, Florida
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
CHARLES E. GOODELL, New York
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
DAVE MARTIN, Nebraska
ALPHONZO BELL, California
OGDEN R. REID, New York
GLENN ANDREWS, Alabama
EDWARD J. GURNEY, Florida
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois

LOUISE MAXIENNE DARGANS, *Chief Clerk*
RUSSELL C. DERRICKSON, *Staff Director*
C. SUMNER STONE, *Special Assistant to the Chairman*
DR. EUNICE S. MATTHEW, *Education Chief*
LEON ABRAMSON, *Chief Counsel for Labor-Management*
ODELL CLARK, *Chief Investigator*
TERESA CALABRESE, *Administrative Assistant to the Chairman*
MICHAEL J. BERNSTEIN, *Minority Counsel for Education and Labor*
CHARLES W. RADCLIFFE, *Special Education Counsel for Minority*

TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
CARLTON R. SICKLES, Maryland
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
ALPHONZO BELL, California

H. Con. Res. 1007 Passed October 17, 1966

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

AT THE SECOND SESSION

Begun and held at the City of Washington on Monday, the tenth day of January, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six

Concurrent Resolution

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the document entitled "International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects," a report by the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, be printed as a House document and that an additional seven thousand copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

FRANCIS R. VALEO,
Secretary of the Senate.

CONTENTS

Page

- LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL IX
- FOREWORD XI
- HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS 1
  - EDUCATION FOR A WORLD COMMUNITY 1
    - International Education: Shadow and Substance by Stephen K. Bailey 1
    - American Responsibilities in International Education by Frank Bowles 8
  - THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT 16
    - President's Message on International Education by Lyndon B. Johnson 16
    - The Federal Government and the Universities by Kenneth W. Mildenberger 23
  - THE ROLE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES 30
    - The Present World Challenge to Higher Education by Claude S. Phillips, Jr. 30
    - The University in Our Civilization by John W. Gardner 40
    - The University in World Affairs: An Introduction by William W. Marvel 46
    - The College and University in International Affairs by the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 52
    - Peace, Understanding and Education by, Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. 56
    - The Role of the University in Developing World Community by Paul A. Miller 62
    - The Enlisted University by Steven Muller 73
    - The International Programs of American Universities by the Institute of Advanced Projects, East-West Center 78
    - The University and World Affairs by the Committee on the University and World Affairs 84
  - FOUNDATIONS AND WORLD AFFAIRS EDUCATION 90
    - The Role of the Foundations by George M. Beckmann 90
- INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM 101
  - LIBERAL LEARNING IN A CHANGING WORLD 101
    - Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs by Percy W. Bidwell 101
    - The College and World Affairs, a report of the Committee on the College and World Affairs 106
    - Retooling for a New Liberal Arts Program by Warren L. Hickman 116
    - Toward a Universal Curriculum by F. Champion Ward 120
    - Undergraduate International Programs: A Rationale and an Approach by Wallace L. Anderson 125
    - The World in Higher Education by C. Easton Rothwell 130
    - Russian and Other Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education by Robert F. Byrnes and John M. Thompson 133
    - Asian Studies for Undergraduates by William Theodore de Bary 155
    - Teaching Materials for Foreign Area Instruction by Robert F. Byrnes 161
    - The Challenge for Foreign Area Studies by Richard M. Morse 168
  - LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES 178
    - The Leadership of the Universities by George F. Taylor 178
    - NDEA Langauge and Area Centers by Donald N. Bigelow and Lyman H. Legters 188
    - Colgate University by Theodore Herman 197
    - The State University College at New Paltz, New York by the Commission on International Understanding, Association of American Colleges 202
    - New Graduate Programs in Modern Foreign Languages by Daymond Turner 211

INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM—Continued

LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES—Continued

Page

- Recommendations and Suggestions by the Commission on International Understanding, Association of American Colleges 216
- What Should Be the Role of Area Programs in the 60s? by Ward Morehouse 226
- Undergraduate Instruction in Critical Languages and Area Studies by the Conference on Undergraduate Instruction in Critical Languages and Area Studies 230
- Summary and Recommendations by the Princeton University Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in the United States 233
- Conference Report by the Conference on Critical Languages in Liberal Arts Colleges 237

TEACHING RESOURCES 239

- Strengthening the Faculty and Teaching Resources by the Committee on the College and World Affairs 239
- Teacher Education for International Goals by H. Kenneth Barker 247

LIBRARY RESOURCES 252

- Area Studies and Library Resources by Chauncy D. Harris 252
- The General Research Library and Area-Studies Programs by Frederick H. Wagman 255

THE NEED FOR RESEARCH 266

- University Responsibilities and International Development Research by Ralph Smuckler 266
- The Quality of Aid by David E. Bell 281
- Educational Development by R. Freeman Butts 283

THE ETHICS OF OVERSEAS RESEARCH 289

- The Life and Death of Project Camelot by Irving Louis Horowitz 289
- American Academic Ethics and Social Research Abroad by Kalman H. Silvert 304
- Reflections After Three Years in the Foreign Affairs Contract Research World by William J. Nagle 315

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES 319

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES 319

- The Foreign Student in America by John F. Melby 319
- College and University Programs of Academic Exchange by The Committee on Educational Interchange Policy 327
- The Foreign Student Adviser and His Institution in International Student Exchange by Ivan Putman, Jr. 331
- The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome? a report of the EWA Study Committee on Foreign Student Affairs 335
- Foreign Students: Exchange or Immigration? by Gregory Henderson 348
- Foreign Aid and the Brain Drain by James A. Perkins 354
- The Foreign Student Adviser and His Institution in International Student Exchange by Ivan Putman, Jr. 362
- Should the Foreign Engineering Student Return to His Native Land to Practice His Profession? by Thomas F. Jones 364
- The Overseas Selection of Foreign Students, a report from Education and World Affairs 367

UNITED STATES STUDENTS ABROAD 371

- The Student Abroad by Irwin Abrams 371
- Undergraduate Study Abroad by Stephen A. Freeman 387
- College and University Programs of Academic Exchange by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy 393

FACULTY AND SCHOLARS ABROAD 396

- Beacon of Hope by The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs 396
- College and University Programs of Academic Exchange by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy 404

THE PEACE CORPS 408

- A New Education Program for the Peace Corps by Harris L. Wofford 408

Page
EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT 413
WHAT ROLE FOR THE UNIVERSITY? 413
Universities for Export: Agenda for Some Thinking by Sir Eric Ashby 413
The Universities' Stake in the Developing Nations by Harold L. Enarson 424
Universities and the Foreign Assistance Program by Robert M. Rosenzweig 427
The Universities and International Technical Assistance by Lynton K. Caldwell 434
The World Role of Universities by Edward W. Weidner 441
American Professionals Overseas by Irwin T. Sanders 445
EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT 457
The Role of Education in Developing Societies by Adam Curle 457
Problems of Developing Higher Education in the Newly Developing Countries by Frederick Harbison 465
ORGANIZING FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION 475
COORDINATION ON CAMPUS 475
Developing the International Office by Joe W. Neal 475
INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION 481
Some Aspects of University Cooperation in International Education by Stewart E. Fraser 481
Cooperation for International Education by Shepherd L. Witman 485
Among Indiana Colleges by John M. Thompson 490
The Consortium Approach by Royden Dangerfield 497
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: THE PROSPECT 503
Education of Americans for International Cooperation by Felix C. Robb 503
Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs by Percy W. Bidwell 510
Relating International Developments to the Undergraduate Curriculm by William W. Marvel 519
The University in World Affairs: Questions and Issues, a report from Education and World Affairs 528
BIBLIOGRAPHY 546

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

AUGUST 16, 1966.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This committee print is the result of an effort to bring together in a relatively brief volume a selection of important readings from the existing literature in the field of international education.

The growing interest in the United States in this field is represented by President Johnson's message to Congress on international education and health of February 2, 1966, as well as by the consideration the President's proposals are now receiving in Congress. For example, on the same day as the message, you and I introduced in the House of Representatives, and Senator Wayne Morse in the Senate, the International Education Act of 1966, which is aimed at strengthening the resources of American colleges and universities in international studies and research.

Our committee's Task Force on International Education, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, held several days of hearings on the International Education Act of 1966 in late March and early April; on April 27, the full Committee on Education and Labor favorably reported the bill as H.R. 14643; and on June 6 the House of Representatives passed the bill without amendment. It now awaits action in the Senate.

I should point out that this committee print touches not only on the programs authorized by the International Education Act but on the entire spectrum of issues and problems in international education. The print can be fairly described as a landmark in its field, for it collects in one convenient volume some of the best published and unpublished material on international education.

As chairman of the Task Force on International Education, I have observed that international education has different meanings for different people. To some it means young Americans studying abroad, to others it means exchange professors, to still others it means welcoming students from abroad to our schools, colleges and universities. To some international education means the efforts of one nation to help build the educational institutions of another country; to others it means study, research, and teaching at educational institutions here in the United States.

The Task Force, in its consideration of the International Education Act of 1966, focused primarily on the last category, the development of the capacity of our own institutions of higher education to teach and conduct research about foreign lands and world problems. It has become increasingly clear to the members of the Task Force that all of the activities I have cited bear upon international studies; it has become clear as well that our colleges and universities, as they shape their programs, must plan in terms of the way each of their activities in international education interacts with and affects the others.

I am confident, therefore, that this volume will prove valuable to even the most advanced specialists in the field—in part because it contains selections from over a dozen essays which have never been published before—as well as to university trustees, officials of government and of private foundations, students and interested citizens generally. The primary readership which the Task Force has had in mind, however, is Members of Congress and the faculty and administrators of our colleges and universities. In an attempt to keep the volume of manageable size, some valuable material has been omitted, particularly when it is readily available elsewhere or where it would be impractical to quote from the source other than at considerable length.

I wish to express my gratitude to a number of individuals who contributed greatly to the preparation of this volume. Valuable assistance has been supplied by Dr. Herman B Wells and Peter N. Gillingham, who have served respectively as consultant and counsel for the Task Force, and by Dr. Eunice S. Matthew, education chief of the Committee on Education and Labor. The primary effort in assembling and editing the material for this volume has been provided on a volunteer basis by Allan A. Michie, director of information and publications for Education and World Affairs, and his colleagues Sandra Krebs, Morgan Rankin and Mary Ryan. I wish also to thank the president and Board of Trustees of Education and World Affairs for permitting these persons to donate their time.

I am, of course, especially indebted to those individuals, periodicals, publishers, institutions and organizations which have granted permission to reprint or include extracts from their publications.

The text has been supplemented with a bibliography which, at least with regard to publications in recent years, attempts to provide substantially more comprehensive coverage than the text itself. While I assume responsibility for all sins of omission and commission, I am most grateful to the several persons who assisted in compiling the bibliography. Their names are listed immediately before the bibliography.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

JOHN BRADEMAS, *Member of Congress,*
Chairman, Task Force on International Education.

FOREWORD

One of the most significant pieces of legislation to be handled by the House Committee on Education and Labor is H.R. 14643, The International Education Act of 1966.

The able direction given to the development of this legislation by the Committee's Task Force on International Education, chaired by Representative John Brademas, is amply demonstrated by the publication of this volume. It is a comprehensive and substantive compilation of searching and instructive treatises on a broad spectrum of problems and issues in international education.

The time has come for schools, colleges, and universities in the United States to realize the importance of the international dimensions which education must embrace. No field of intellectual activity should escape the tests of completeness and validity by restriction to the narrow, provincial, or chauvinistic confines of the interests and experiences of only a segment of the human race.

Indeed, the links between learned men across the globe grow closer in this age of instant travel, communication, and interaction. If the life of an intellectual must be international, his education must most certainly be also. Scholarship in medicine, education, engineering, philosophy, religion, economics, government, law, commerce, and the other disciplines must be viewed globally and comparatively.

The involvements of this Nation in the affairs of the world put new demands upon education. An educational system must today produce citizens who are equipped with the knowledge, sensitivities, and competencies for functioning intelligently in the vital and extensive areas where diverse cultures meet and must accommodate without the biases and misinformation which generate fruitless tensions and devastating conflicts.

Accordingly, it will not be sufficient for international studies to give scant consideration to the history and culture of the peoples of the Non-Western World. The rise of the nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America will constitute the major concerns of the U.S. foreign policy for some years ahead. The political, social, economic, and cultural aspects of the lives of the peoples of these most populous parts of the world must be given more than casual and off-the-top-of-the-head treatment in our schools and universities. As President Johnson said in his 1966 Message on International Education, "The conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms."

Our schools, colleges, and universities will need to define their roles and to initiate educational programs which give evidence of the serious and broad scope which international studies must embrace.

There are institutions which have done outstanding work in developing programs of international education and which have rendered noteworthy international service. For the most part, these undertakings have been left to some few adventurous members of the faculty whose interests and work in connection with distant places were at best regarded as some kind of idiosyncrasy. With the enactment of the International Education Act of 1966, there will be the opportunity for many and, hopefully, all educational institutions to broaden the vision of every phase of their curriculums, precisely to achieve the necessary international and universal perspective indicated in this volume.

The role of the Federal Government in supporting international education—education to function effectively in a multicultural universe—is aimed primarily at enabling our schools and universities to carry forward the essential training and research in international studies.

Every safeguard for the protection of academic freedom will be observed. Each institution will be free to determine its own programs in international education under the provisions of this legislation. Universities are not to become tools of the Government but are to be free and uncompromising contributors to the emerging culture of this era.

This volume will serve as a splendid guide for the members of this committee and of the Congress in understanding the tasks for which the International Education Act will give support.

I commend the Task Force on International Education of this committee, Dr. Eunice Matthew, and the staff of Education and World Affairs who ably assisted in the production of this work.

Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS

EDUCATION FOR A WORLD COMMUNITY

International Education: Shadow and Substance

by Stephen K. Bailey

Mr. Bailey is dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, and also serves as chairman of the Commission on International Education of the American Council on Education.

The term "international education" may be used to refer to the non-American substance of school and university curriculums in the United States. Under this broad interpretation, all courses in world or alien history, geography, sociology, anthropology, politics, economics, international relations, and law, science, art, letters, language, music, philosophy, and religion can properly be included under the rubric of international education.

Second, the phrase may be used to refer to education provided in the United States for students from abroad. * * * What we in American education do for and to these visitors—and what they do for us—is most certainly an important aspect of international education.

Third, the United States at any one time has tens of thousands of its own students—and hundreds of faculty—living and studying abroad. * * *

Fourth, international education is used increasingly to refer to the organizing and staffing of educational institutions in newly developing nations by educators from more developed areas of the world.

Fifth, international education is frequently viewed in a reasonably narrow professional sense to refer to the undergraduate and graduate professional training of those intent on careers in international service.

Finally—but I suppose not really finally—international education can be looked at as a problem in adult citizenship: involving attempts made by leading statesmen to educate their following to the complexities and responsibilities of the age in which we live; and the supporting efforts of universities, the mass media, and social, professional, interest group, and civic organizations to increase public understanding of world affairs.

Behind all of these efforts there seem to be three interrelated goals: (1) to prepare men and women for wise public leadership in the sciences and arts of governance in a critically interdependent and rapidly changing and evolving world; (2) to cultivate the soil of civic understanding so that informed leadership can reap enlightened response and constructively critical support from mass political followership; and (3) to heighten the sense of option, variety, excitement, and identity in peoples across the face of the globe whose esthetic and social sensibilities can be sharpened only by insights into the world beyond their familial and neighborhood surroundings. The first two goals set the conditions for the third. The good society, in an international sense, is increasingly a prerequisite for realization of the types of individual fulfillment suggested in point 3. But even if our sights were lowered—even if our concern were only with that degree of order necessary for the physical preservation of the race and the increasing separation of man from the tyrannies of ignorance, morbidity, hunger, and passion which afflict the majority of mankind—international education in some or all of its meanings would remain a basic necessity.

Vague, ambiguous, and multifaceted as it must remain, the phrase "international education" warrants our concern and sustained attention. I can do little more * * * than suggest some of its more obvious dimensions. Our real task, however, is not to reflect upon my or anyone else's generalizations, but to translate known generalizations into specific programs and fearless experimentation. For there is more shadow than substance to international education today in all of its various meanings. We are doing far too little to orient man to his global context; and what we do do along these lines is frequently misguided, misplaced, or woefully short of the mark.

Let me begin, however, with some positive points of substance. We are doing far more today than ever before, in curriculums at all levels, to introduce students to the broader world of which they are a part. My sixth-grade daughter knows far more about African geography and culture than I knew at her age. Thousands of new courses in scores of disciplines in hundreds of colleges and universities have been added in the past quarter of a century in area studies, international relations, in comparative politics, literature, art, and science. The jet, and foundation and government largess, have speeded tens of thousands of students and scholars to all parts of the globe for research and reflection. The growing awareness of the need by more-developed countries to invest in the educational programs of less-developed areas is heartening. Undergraduate and graduate professional interest in international and overseas experiences and careers presently outruns effective career demands—public and private—except perhaps, on a short-term basis, in the insatiable and exciting operations of the Peace Corps. The United Nations, the White House, the Congress, radio, television, the press, and countless professional conventions and civic gatherings keep the alert citizen at least titivated and concerned—if not fully informed—about selected aspects of international affairs.

All of these developments are potentially, at least, on the plus side. This is the present day substance of international education and it reflects a marked improvement over the isolationism and chauvinism of an earlier age.

But if there is substance there are also shadows—long shadows. It is to be subject of these shadows that I wish to devote the balance of any remarks. I do this without pessimism. I do so actually with a profound sense of optimism; but with the full and sober recognition that unless we apply ourselves with energy and imagination * * * to the dispelling of these shadows, they will live to haunt and perhaps to destroy us.

The first shadow is that the international materials in our formal educational curriculums are by and large superficial, nonmemorable, uncoordinated, and still far too Western oriented. Columbia University until recently has had a contemporary civilization course—known for years as the Columbia C.C. The course was ribbed by many academicians because it only gave a "c.c. of this and a c.c. of that". Having taught the Columbia syllabus at Wesleyan University I was far less disturbed by the superficiality of the materials than I was by their exclusively Western orientation. The historic civilization of Asia and Islam were totally ignored. No attempt was made to relate the village peasantry of the Middle Ages to the village peasantry of the contemporary Middle East—to fashion, in other words, useful and memorable generic propositions of continuing value to the student as world citizen.

What was true of the old C.C. course is, alas, true of all too many humanistic, social, and scientific courses in our schools and colleges designed to give an international content to the curriculum. Far too often the courses are Western oriented, fragmentary, and episodic. They leave no real understanding of other lands and cultures. Instead they float through the students minds like disparate TV programs on a Saturday night. We in education have rationalized our own failures by expecting maturing students to put together what academic disciplinary gods have put asunder. We have really not asked in any systematic way what coherent view or views of the world our educational system as a whole should provide—and at what levels. There are dangers in imposing central themes and coherent structures on what we teach, but there are even greater dangers if we do not. In international education especially we need fresh and exciting dietary concepts around which to organize what has become a vast cafeteria of empiricism.

I submit that international law and organization is one such concept: the attempts of communities of men to deal with each other for purposes of mutual protection and economic and cultural enrichment. History, geography, political science, economics, sociology, anthropology, literature, and the arts can all contribute to an understanding of this general field. No one discipline can do the job by itself. If future citizens are to understand the options of mutuality—and the problems related thereto—we in education must (in Paul Appleby's felicitous phrase) begin to make a "mesh of things."

And we must open up new subjects for discussion and thought. The fact that in thousands of school districts in America the United Nations is considered too controversial for classroom discussion is one of the saddest commentaries on contemporary education in this country.

When we turn to the matter of international educational exchange, we find ourselves in a veritable jungle. Over 200,000 people a year study outside of their own country. We have yet to evaluate in any meaningful way what the impact of foreign study is upon students—either in this country or abroad. In all too many cases, junior years abroad do little but establish ethnocentric American enclaves in foreign lands. In all too many cases, foreign students are brought to the United States without proper advanced screening and without adequate institutional and social guidance during their stay. Furthermore colleges and universities wobble between a single standard of academic toughness and a fuzzy and unstructured dual standard of leniency for foreign students. In many institutions a hesitant foreign accent or a limited English style or vocabulary is worth 10 percentage points on any final examination. We have not really sorted out the special levels and academic flexibilities needed to handle the peculiar gradations of background which we blithely import by the tens of thousands. Reports on the capacities of foreign societies to absorb returning trainees are often distressing. * * * We must conduct far more sophisticated research into experiences to date. * * *

When we examine the educational needs in the newly developing sections of the world, and our overseas relationships to these needs, we move into turbulent and uncharted seas. In a recent book edited by Clarence Hunnicutt called "America's Emerging Role in Overseas Education," James Roby Kidd suggests that our mission in development education should be to (1) stimulate and awaken minds and spirits of men and women; (2) develop confidence and self-trust which are the necessary conditions of responsibility; (3) give greater competence in the conduct of family and country life as well as in vocations; (4) develop participation in vocational and political processes, and (5) bring insight and conviction to those who have leadership responsibilities.

These are as noble as they are vague and unoperational. When one leaves these great expectations and moves to the level of an AID or Peace Corps teacher in Nyasaland or Peru the world becomes real, earnest, and awfully complex. Professor Kidd's five great goals become transmogrified into such mundane questions as (1) how can I teach anything effectively under an ex-colonial expatriate or a missionary mentor who administers the school to which I have been assigned, and who has archaic pedagogical notions; (2) what good does it do to teach boys and girls when many of them will disappear into the bush after 3 or 4 years of elementary training only to revert to a preliterate state; (3) how can I overcome latent or overt racial or nationalistic hostilities to the point where my older students will develop a will to believe and to absorb what I say; (4) how can I get my blackboard repaired; and (5) is what I teach going to improve social order and growth or will it simply promote social tension and heightened frustration?

Education has become a magic word in many parts of the newly developing world. Too often the trappings of education are valued more highly than the realities of education. Too often the society cannot absorb into useful roles the training it fosters; or it has not measured its own manpower and consequently educational requirements against its own societal goals. If we are not to waste untold resources of men and money, we must begin to think through what we are trying to do under the rubric of educational assistance and fashion programs which are at once idealistic and toughminded. Education is unquestionably the key to development, but education for whom, when, according to what priorities, in what areas, and how taught, has to this point not even been formulated into meaningful questions—

except by a handful of dedicated people like Fred Harbison and Philip Coombs.

The encouraging thing, of course, is the essential faith in education demonstrated by hundreds of leaders and millions of followers in the developing world. The discouraging thing is that the developed nations to date have done so little about this global problem, and that so few educational projects have been thought through in terms of both ends and means. The path to modernization will be rocky and long at best; but this gives even greater urgency to the allocation of brainpower and financial and technical resources to this extensive frontier.

The professional training of men and women for careers of international service is, I suppose, one of my major personal responsibilities. I only wish I were more secure in my own educational philosophy. There are inherent tensions between the academic world and the world of action. The great scholar is not necessarily the great administrator or politician. Graduate education in the United States is largely devoted to the preparation of the former rather than the latter. The academic mind likes to reproduce itself, and often finds itself uncomfortable with students who want to understand—not for the sake of understanding—but as a basis for action. The dilemma was put definitively by Socrates.

In the sixth book of Plato's Republic, Socrates poses one of his most uncomfortable questions. "Inasmuch," he says, "as philosophers only are able to grasp the eternal and unchangeable, and those who wander in the region of the many and variable are not philosophers, I must ask you which of the two classes should be the rulers of our State?"

The dialogue continues for a few pages with the presumption in favor of philosophers until one of Socrates' companions inserts a disquieting comment. He points out that although Socrates can top all comers in setting logical traps and inducing logical assent, the fact remains that most "votaries of philosophy, when they carry on the study, not only in youth as a part of education, but as the pursuit of their maturer years * * * become strange monsters, not to say utter rogues, and that those who may be considered the best of them are made useless to the world" by the very study which Socrates extols.

Socrates answers with a parable about a ship. "The true pilot," he says, "must pay attention to the year and seasons and sky and stars and winds, and whatever else belongs to his art, if he intends to be really qualified for the command of a ship."

Unfortunately, in Socrates' parable, the pilot is in chains because his crew—calling him "a prater, a stargazer, a good-for-nothing"—has mutinied.

I have come across nothing in the literature of political science or education which summarizes more succinctly the dilemma of those of us charged with the responsibility of training men for statecraft. It makes little sense for the pilot to know how to navigate if he can't control his crew. It makes just as little sense for the pilot to be able to control his crew if he knows nothing about the seasons, the sky, the stars, and the wind—knowledge upon which the safety and success of the voyage depend. Thought, which is the stuff of universities, is rarely wedded happily to the "region of the many and the variable" which is the world of public life. Those who see the stars most steadily are only exceptionally those who can keep the crew from thoughts of mutiny. In our history, effective public leadership has rarely come from men with sharply disciplined analytical and theoretical minds. Woodrow Wilson, Robert McNamara, and John Kennedy may be exceptions, but at crucial points in attempting to rechart the course of the ship of state, all of these have found themselves backed by ugly crews.

Is there, then, something fundamentally anomalous about the concept of advanced university education for public life—including international service? Is hard thought the natural enemy of human empathy? Is the search for truth and consequences in terms of intellectual systems relatable in any meaningful way to the softer compromises, empathetic delicacies, and ruder communications of human affairs? Was Aristotle correct when he commented in the preface to his ethics that "a young man is not a proper hearer of lectures on political science; for he is inexperienced in the actions that occur in life."

More than a decade ago, a distinguished British civil servant, Sir James Griggs, delivered a lecture at Princeton in which he said the following:

> I do not believe in institutes or theoretical courses of public administration. In our system, at any rate, much the most important requirement is the ability to manage men—whether they are our fellow civil servants subordinate to us or the more senior civil servants and the politicians above us, or, whether again, it is the man in the street who is at once the toad under the barrow and our ultimate master. And I am convinced that the art of managing men cannot be imparted in schools and university courses or public lectures. Like most of the really important capacities, it can only be acquired by learning to do it in practice.

And Sir James did not stop there. He challenged the value of legal training and of training in economics for anyone intent upon the general administrative part of the public service. Sir James felt that law was too narrowing, and that economics was maddeningly complicated, abstruse, and inexact—and ultimately subordinate to political considerations anyway.

Was Sir James right?

Or are those right who claim that what we need in men of affairs today are fewer brokers and compromisers and human relations experts and more toughminded analysts, theoreticians, and intellectual innovators capable of understanding and applying the systems of thought developed by what Aristotle called the contemplative as distinct from the political minds in society?

Should the ship's captain be a navigator or a human relations expert? Ideally, I suppose, he should be both. But can the one be learned only at the expense of the other? Is the brilliant and toughminded expert in navigation a tolerable captain for a democratic ship of state?

The Maxwell School at Syracuse, Littauer at Harvard, the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton, the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at Pittsburgh, the School of International Service at American University, the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Cornell's Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, and a number of other similar institutions are living fretfully on the horns of these dilemmas. At Maxwell alone we have going a half dozen or more educational experiments in the field of professional training for international and overseas affairs—including some extraordinarily exciting overseas fellowships and internship programs. But it is far too early to tell how effective these experiments will turn out to be—if indeed it is possible to measure their success at all. At this stage the important thing seems to me to be the fearlessness of experimentation and the willingness to tackle the dilemmas prescribed by the confrontation of social science and social engineering in the international field.

Finally, we come to the question of international education for the adult citizen. Even if we could suddenly reform the present educational system at the primary, secondary, college, and university levels, the dividends for the society as a whole would accrue years and decades in the future. In the meantime, leaders must lead and followers must follow—critically and creatively—if the dangerous international road directly before us is to be safely and successfully negotiated. The essential educational burden here is in the hands of our political leaders; but this must be buttressed by extraordinary educational efforts on the part of the mass media and civic and professional organizations across the land—and beyond. We in formal education have a special responsibility here: to act as master brokers among politicians, experts, and the laymen. Some of our energies must continue to be devoted to the enlightenment of ourselves and of other adult citizens on complex matters of state. For like it or not, we are looked upon as opinion leaders in the society. Responsibility in thought and action on our part can have an important effect upon the behavior of both our political leaders and our fellow adult citizens as collectively we attempt to ride the winds of change. What is thrown at the adult citizen at present is a cacophony of conflicting views and opinions. In one sense this is as it should be, for we are all votaries of a system of government which puts high priority upon the marketplace of opinion. But we must help each other to set standards of credence and philosophies of action which can help us to distinguish truth from falsehood and fact from value. Unless we look at education—including international education—as a lifelong process, events will outrun the capacity of our schools and colleges to deal with them.

Here then are at least a few of the implications of the term "international education." We must build upon the encouraging substance which exists; but we must do far more than we have done to dispel the shadows which still haunt our collective endeavors.

Albert Camus once described our essential task. "We must forge for ourselves," he wrote, "an art of living through times of catastrophe, in order to be reborn, and then to fight openly against the death-instinct which is at work in our time." This, I suppose, is at the heart of all international education regardless of definition.

I call you, as I must call myself, to this imperative mission. (Annual School of Education Spring Lecture, Cornell University, April 30, 1963.)

American Responsibilities in International Education

*by Frank Bowles**

Mr. Bowles is Education Program Director of the Ford Foundation.

Our earliest commitment to international education began a century ago. It has now been greatly reduced, but its memory and the institutions through which it operated remain, probably because it had the twin virtues of being both praiseworthy and sensible. It was essentially a commitment to a mission form of education in China, Japan, and the Near East. We supported other missions, of course, but it was in these regions that the educational beginnings developed into true secondary and higher education in the American definition. The institutions that were formed were American, built with American money, staffed with American teachers, using American programs, methods, and standards. Only the students were foreign, and the best of these were selected for further training in the United States. It was this early flow of selected foreign students to selected American colleges, usually Presbyterian, Baptist, or Methodist, that set a pattern which still dominates much of our thinking about foreign students.

These institutions had a strong influence wherever they were established. In China, in Lebanon, in Turkey, and to a lesser extent in Japan, they had a large role in the education of those who became political leaders or who formed the professional classes. They played a part in the formation of national systems of higher education. They were, in fact, so important to the intellectual health of the countries in which they were located that they have continued their existence and a measure of their influence even when walled about by nationalism. In the extreme instance of Communist China, the very virulence of the official anti-Western expression is a continuing tribute to the effectiveness of the American influence established there through education.

The reduction of this commitment has not been because of any real change in American attitudes. Indeed, our missionary spirit is as strong as ever—the Peace Corps attests to that. Rather, what has happened has been the coming of age of the institutions that expressed the commitment. The American University of Beirut, Robert College, International Christian College, and others, all continue to rest in part on American support, but each of them has now become in its own right a national institution, with its own obligation to national cultural values, and its own national sources of support. It is this change, which in a way is a tremendous affirmation of success, that has altered the first commitment to international education. This commitment, a century ago, was large in relation to the system which

---

*The Educational Record, Winter 1964. Copyright 1964, American Council on Education.

supported it, and it had, I think, a commensurate influence within that system in attitudes toward international education and in shaping the ideas and careers of students. * * *

The nature of our commitments

We have now developed other concerns within international education to replace our first one, and we are finding ourselves in the midst of a complicated business. This is obvious from the number of committees, commissions, organizations, and reports that have recently made their appearance. Collectively, these represent an effort to probe and define the problems that accompany our concerns. There has been progress, for we have begun to enlarge our organization for dealing with the new problems, and we have, in the Gardner report,[1] a rare achievement in the result of a probing self-examination presented with a genuine elegance of style. But it is clear that we have not yet come to decisions on purpose, on means, or on organization.

I offer the suggestion that one, perhaps the main, reason we find it necessary to search for means and purposes is that we have not one, but several, sets of commitments that we are trying to meet through the same methods and means.

To students from other nations

We have one commitment to open American education to students from other countries. Under it, we bring students to American institutions as undergraduates or for professional study, or graduate study, or research, or technical training. The tone of this undertaking was set long ago by our first commitment to international education. It was and is to provide opportunity for higher education for students who could not find it in their own countries and, if need be, to provide it without cost to the students. The majority of students coming under the early programs were Asiatic, and the programs today are still strongly oriented to the same group. This is our largest commitment at present in numbers of students. It is the one on which our institutions tend to focus and to which they devote their greatest efforts, for foreign students are very tangible on a campus. They bring a symbolic contact with other parts of the world, which some of our institutions stress and venerate almost to the point of absurdity. They also bring problems of student finance, of performance, and even of termination. But the commitment has a long and valid tradition of accomplishment, and this means more to us than our many troubles.

To American students to study abroad

We have another commitment to open to American students the possibility of study in foreign institutions. Under it, thousands go abroad each year. Some remain as undergraduates within the shelter of American institutions through such ingenious arrangements as the junior year abroad and the overseas campuses of American colleges. Others follow specific planned programs within European institutions, and others—not very numerous—study for degrees from foreign institutions.

The tone of this commitment was set at the beginning of this century by the Rhodes scholarships, which emphasized environment and style, with educational achievement an important but not controlling feature. The junior year abroad continued this tone, and brought continental universities into the pattern. The Fulbright scholarships, which do emphasize educational achievement, have brought a needed strength to the study-abroad idea, and they also enlarged its scope by opening opportunities in countries outside of Europe. However, despite changes and enlargements, we continue to look upon study abroad as an American undergraduate experience within a European environment. This may explain why few Americans become identified with foreign institutions to the extent of taking foreign degrees, and explains in part why the European image of American institutions stresses an alleged low academic standard and neglects, or even flatly denies, the existence of our graduate and professional schools.

---

[1] "A Beacon of Hope: The Exchange-of-Persons Program," a report from the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs (Washington: Department of State, 1963).

Both of these commitments are to students, and it is significant that they are executed institutionally and supported by private or institutional funds. When Government funds have come into them, as in the Fulbright program, much of the administration of them has followed patterns set by the institutional programs. It is of interest that few European students come to us under the first of these commitments, which means that we do not have a true exchange program with European education. It is also of interest that few Americans study in non-European countries, which means that we cannot draw on our own former overseas students for firsthand information about the countries and institutions from which we draw our foreign students. * * *

To Latin American countries

We have some other commitments in international education. One is dramatically presented by the Alliance for Progress. The Alliance is avowedly an attempt to speed up the social and economic development of our Latin American neighbors. We sometimes speak of these as underdeveloped countries or, more tactfully, as developing countries and this is true by some criteria. But by other criteria they are developed countries. They have governmental structures of long-standing, long-established international relationships, and educational systems that include large universities. The real problem is that many of the nations show chronic political weakness which we trace to their lagging social and economic development. Our commitment to these nations is an effort to eliminate this weakness. One of our major tools in this undertaking is educational development. This we stress on the theory that enlarged educational opportunity will bring about social stability through the creation of a middle class, and will stimulate industrial development by providing a trained labor force. The combination of the two will attract capital and lead to economic advance through industrialization, and the end result will be political stability.

We are undertaking this educational development by means of a series of projects established through governmental channels and implemented by task forces supplied by our own educational institutions on contract with our Government. Some projects have also been supported by foundations, though most of their work so far has been along the lines of attempting to establish the basic educational dialog between the systems of education which must precede concerted action.

We appear to be having a difficult time with this commitment. There may be several reasons for this. Governments, and particularly ministries of education, do not tend to be warmly receptive to programs planned to change their own functions and achievements, for whatever good purpose. Governmental channels for handling money are sometimes clogged, sometimes leaky, sometimes both. Universities do not take kindly to criticism, and Latin American universities are no exception to the rule. We have no background of experience with Latin education—relatively few Latin students have been educated in this country, and almost none of our students have been educated in Latin America. We tend to think the same words mean the same things in our two languages, which is not so. We, surprisingly, operate too slowly for the Latins, who have been trained to expect instant results from anything Americans undertake.

We are having our own educational difficulties, too, in carrying out the commitment. The fact that it is under the policy direction of our Government tends to throw educational institutions into a purely technical role, supplying services to fit into a policy which they have not formed. Because it is a program for the strengthening of institutions and systems, individual students become submerged into the anonymity of programs and plans. Hence, our institutions do not, and perhaps cannot, see the whole of the problem with which they are working. This brings up a legitimate question about how an institution-building program can prosper if our own institutions have not been a party to the planning of it, and do not have power of decision in its execution. Another question, equally legitimate, concerns how such a program can be sustained without careful attention to the selection and training of students and younger faculty members, in which our institutions participate.

* * *

To newly independent nations

Another major commitment has taken form in the effort to develop the educational systems of a group of nations which, until recently, were colonies of European countries.

Most of these countries when they became independent had only a small educational structure and little or no higher education. It was postulated, in connection with plans for their course after independence, that a sizable structure of higher education would be required to supply the manpower necessary to lead them in social and economic development. Because they seemed poorly equipped to build such a structure, we offered to assume a double obligation. On the one hand we would assist with teachers, with know-how, and with money in the development of their own institutions. On the other hand we would open our own institutions to meet their immediate needs for higher education, and after their institutions did begin to develop we would supplement and support their efforts.

This was a warm and generous posture, rich in intention. But matters did not work out as planned. For one thing these countries proved to have strong and self-willed governments, interested in the political fruits of immediate educational changes, rather than in waiting a generation for the results of planning to appear. For another, the connections between the new countries and their mother countries proved closer than anticipated. The ties of language, culture, education, and governmental forms had always been present but submerged by the fact of colonialism. Once colonialism was removed, the latent ties emerged, particularly in education. They therefore all retained their accustomed systems, and, doing so, have not always welcomed the appearance of the American system, which operates on a different concept. Rather they have preferred the use of American money for the support of their own systems, or, if that is not freely available, they have tended to use our system as a technical resource, sending students to us for certain types of studies, and drawing on us for assistance with specific programs.

As a third point, it has been found that many of the problems that appeared in higher education in these newly formed countries could actually be traced back to primary and secondary education, which meant that the needs were not quite those we had been led to expect. The net result of all these factors has been that this commitment too has moved more slowly than we had hoped it would.

This commitment has been carried on through a mixture of public and private funds. Foundations have taken the lead in planning; universities have made direct contributions to the training of individuals; Government programs have come in to assist in major developments.

To international organizations

In addition to these four forms of commitment, we have two others which are large enough to require mention. We carry, through our Government, one-third of UNESCO's budget, and UNESCO is concerned with many of the activities that have been mentioned, although their emphasis tends to be on the primary and secondary levels, rather than on higher education. We do not send many Americans to work with UNESCO—certainly many fewer than our share of the available posts, and in this failure we lose valuable opportunities for training. This suggests that our commitment to the idea of international responsibility for educational development is not as great as we would like to think it is.

We also have a commitment to educational planning and to the stimulus of educational development through our relationships to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), to NATO, and to SEATO. These organizations have different purposes, but all of them are concerned with economic development and with education as an instrument for such development. * * *

Operational forms of our commitments

A look at these forms of commitment shows that they fall into two categories. One is a direct relationship to educational achievement in which the students are selected as individuals and placed in a specific program which is expected to benefit them. The commitment centers in institutions and is controlled and supported by them. It has received some, but not large amounts of foundation aid.

The other form of commitment is a relationship to governments and systems, sometimes direct between our Government and others, sometimes indirect through an intervening agency such as UNESCO. This form involves analysis, planning, organization, development, and support in varying proportions. It is directed toward the purposes of national development, with, presumably, political factors always present in the background. It is understood that students are the ultimate beneficiaries of improved education, but the actions are not directed specifically toward them. These commitments are largely supported by public funds. Foundation programs have also come into them in support of planning and factfinding operations, and for some special projects.

Observations on our activities

Several observations may be drawn out of the examination of these commitments, and the manner in which we support them.

1. We have been shifting our emphasis in international education away from student movement and toward systems support. This shift has not cut down on the amount of student movement—indeed, it has increased. But it has not increased in proportion to the increase in our expenditures on international education. Had it done so, the number of foreign students in our colleges would have doubled within the last 5 years and would probably double again in another 5 years. In the case of Latin America this would mean that our present 11,000 students would now be 15,000 or more, and, by 1970, 30,000. In choosing not to build up student movement we are in effect turning away from our original methods in international education, which were singularly successful. These are also the methods still followed by France and Great Britain.

2. We have not stated what we are trying to accomplish in our support of educational systems in other countries, particularly Latin America, Africa, and Asia. This may sound like an ingenuous statement. Obviously, we are trying to achieve economic development and political stability. To do this, we are trying to develop the educational system. This means enlarging enrollments, probably means enlarging institutions, and may mean enlarging the entire structure of education. But are we planning to introduce the American system to achieve these goals, or do we perceive other ways of reaching them? Or are we trying to strengthen the existing system without expecting to change it? And what will we do if the system refuses to expand? We need answers to these questions, because as our support of individual systems is accepted and applied, there is need for ever-increasing amounts of money. Unless we have governing policies well understood, there is no end to such needs.

3. We have some handicaps in meeting these commitments. We do not have enough Americans with experience in international education to staff our commitments; we do not know enough about other educational systems to work with them to full advantage; we have never been able to evolve a good system of selecting foreign students to work in American institutions. The institutions which support these commitments, such as the I.I.E., the African-American Institute, Education and World Affairs, the African Scholarship Program of American Universities, the American Council on Education, and others, have still not sorted out their respective tasks, nor their relations to each other or to the Government. And, to complicate matters, other organizations are serving notice that they intend to get into the act. We still do not have any center to which we can turn for informaion, or personnel, or material support.

There is one serious problem we have not solved. The use of universities as a technical resource is educationally devastating and selfdeceptive. They are not used as universities but are necessarily employed piecemeal—a school of librarianship here, a public administration program there, agriculture somewhere else. In piecemeal operations, they rarely command the best administrative talent or the best teachers from the parent institution.

4. Our programs are oriented toward higher education on the ground that weak programs require strengthening. So they do, but the problem is to differentiate between cause and effect. We may miss the cause of weakness in a system because we conceive of higher education in our own definition. What we may see in a country as an incomplete, oligarchic system of higher education, with miserable laboratories, untended libraries, and unpainted and echoing lecture halls, may be, rather, an adequate system within a tradition alien to our own. On the other hand, what we may see as a magnificient program of secondary education may represent limited opportunity, hidden discrimination, and an inadequate supply of students for higher education. Viewing and planning on the basis of what we see, we may build imbalance into our staffing. Very few secondary school men are drawn into the study and planning of our overseas enterprises; yet it is in that area that the problem of student supply and demand is located, and that educational opportunity is controlled.

5. The real strength of our system lies in the doctoral programs in our graduate schools, in our advanced professional programs and our research activities. These have made possible the extension of our own higher education, and they are an indispensable resource in our industrial and economic development. They are also, in terms of size, a small portion of our educational structure, which may be one reason why they have scarcely figured in our overseas activities.

6. The total American commitment to international education—counting student movement in both directions and all forms of aid and support (Government, foundation, institutional, and private)—if calculated in dollars would constitute one of the largest educational systems in the world. At present, the planning and direction of this immense activity is a full-time responsibility for only a few Government servants and a few foundation officials. Otherwise, it is a part-time responsibility for an uncounted number of educators. In a word, it is understaffed at the levels where policies and decisions must be made.

The choices before us

These comments are critical. Criticism is easy but it tends to conceal the real accomplishments that lie beneath the surface. The program that we have mounted has real achievements to its credit. Not least of them is that it has matured to the point where we are actually in a position to take care of most of our needs, for we can define them and we know how they must be met. A documentation and information center, a project clearinghouse, support for studies of problems and policy, a talent roster based on our successful wartime experience, overseas admissions centers, are all technically possible. Furthermore, if we could draw together the money we are spending because we do not have them, we could afford them. We are training Americans in the problems of overseas education. The Fulbright program and the Peace Corps are splendid and effective training programs. We do not make enough contribution to, or draw enough experience from, the United Nations or its specialized agencies, but we can remedy that if we will.

That we can do all of these things underlines the strength of the material resources we command. But it does not clarify our commitments to international education. We face then a clear-cut choice. In one choice, we continue to view our largest commitments as specialized and technical, and our interests as political or economic. In this case, the present form of program, improved as experience requires, will serve effectively.

In another choice, we can put our commitment and our strength behind the type of programs that many of us consider to be our most successful overseas activities. The Peace Corps, the Fulbright program, the program for the selection of African students, and the oversea campuses of American universities are intellectually all of a piece. They represent the joining of two ideas—the opening of the world's resources for the education of Americans; and the extension of American resources to bring new dimensions to education in other nations. Our emphasis in this choice shifts away from the technical and away from the use of education as a means to political and economic ends, and toward the exchange of ideas through the full use of our institutions and those of other nations. But to do this requires willingness on the part of our institutions and our Government agencies to join in a plan, to provide for its implementation, to set up a method of administering it, and, hardest of all, to subordinate themselves to it.

This means that this choice is not easy, for it is easier to commit money than it is to commit institutions and people. But, given our own history and our basic beliefs in the humane purposes of education, it is hard to believe that we will not take it. (*The Educational Record*, Winter 1964)

THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT

President's Message on International Education

by Lyndon B. Johnson

In a special message to Congress on February 2, 1966 the President proposed a broad program for action in the fields of international education and health. The education portion of the message was a direct outgrowth of an address which Mr. Johnson gave on September 16, 1965, to mark the bicentennial celebration of the founder of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. In that address the President indicated the outlines of a program in international education and announced the appointment of a task force to recommend "a broad and long-range plan of worldwide educational endeavor."

The following is the text of the special message dealing with international education:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

To the Congress of the United States:

Last year the Congress by its action declared: the Nation's number one task is to improve the education and health of our people.

Today I call upon Congress to add a world dimension to this task.

I urge the passage of the International Education and Health Acts of 1966.

We would be shortsighted to confine our vision to this Nation's shorelines. The same rewards we count at home will flow from sharing in a worldwide effort to rid mankind of the slavery of ignorance and the scourge of disease.

We bear a special role in this liberating mission. Our resources will be wasted in defending freedom's frontiers if we neglect the spirit that makes men want to be free.

Half a century ago, the philosopher William James declared that mankind must seek "a moral equivalent of war."

The search continues—more urgent today than ever before in man's history.

Ours is the great opportunity to challenge all nations, friend and foe alike, to join this battle.

We have made hopeful beginnings. Many of the programs described in this message have been tested in practice. I have directed our agencies of Government to improve and enlarge the programs already authorized by Congress.

Now I am requesting Congress to give new purpose and new power to our efforts by declaring that:

> Programs to advance education and health are basic building blocks to lasting peace.
>
> They represent a long-term commitment in the national interest.
>
> The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is charged with a broad authority to help strengthen our country's capacity to carry on this noble adventure.

EDUCATION

Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of our international relations.

We have long supported UNESCO and other multilateral and international agencies. We propose to continue these efforts with renewed vigor.

Schooled in the grief of war, we know certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth:

Ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace.

The conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms.

The knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when it is shared.

International education cannot be the work of one country. It is the responsibility and promise of all nations. It calls for free exchange and full collaboration. We expect to receive as much as we give, to learn as well as to teach.

Let this Nation play its part. To this end, I propose:

To strengthen our capacity for international educational cooperation.

To stimulate exchange with students and teachers of other lands.

To assist the progress of education in developing nations.

To build new bridges of international understanding.

I. To strengthen our capacity for international educational cooperation

Our education base in this country is strong. Our desire to work with other nations is great. But we must review and renew the purpose of our programs for international education. I propose to:

1. Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish within his Department a Center for Educational Cooperation

This Center will be a focal point for leadership in international education. While it will not supplant other governmental agencies already conducting programs in this field, it will:

Act as a channel for communication between our missions abroad and the U.S. educational community;

Direct programs assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Assist public and private agencies conducting international education programs.

2. Appoint a Council on International Education

Our commitment to international education must draw on the wisdom, experience, and energy of many people. This Council, to be composed of outstanding leaders of American education, business, labor, the professions, and philanthropy, will advise the Center for Educational Cooperation.

3. Create a Corps of Education Officers to serve in the U.S. Foreign Service

As education's representatives abroad, they will give sharper direction to our programs. Recruited from the ranks of outstanding educators, they will report directly to the Ambassador when serving in foreign missions.

4. Stimulate new programs in international studies for elementary and secondary schools

No child should grow to manhood in America without realizing the promise and the peril of the world beyond our borders. Progress in teaching about world affairs must not lag behind progress made in other areas of American education.

I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to earmark funds from title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, so that our regional education laboratories can enrich the international curricula of our elementary and secondary schools.

5. Support programs of international scope in smaller and developing colleges

Many of our Nation's institutions have been unable to share fully in international projects. By a new program of incentive grants administered through HEW these institutions will be encouraged to play a more active role.

6. Strengthen centers of special competence in international research and training

Over the past two decades, our universities have been a major resource in carrying on development programs around the world. We have made heavy demands upon them. But we have not supported them adequately.

I recommend to the Congress a program of incentive grants administered by HEW for universities and groups of universities—

(*a*) to promote centers of excellence in dealing with particular problems and particular regions of the world.

(*b*) to develop administrative staff and faculties adequate to maintain long-term commitments to oversea educational enterprises.

In addition, I propose that AID be given authority to provide support to American research and educational institutions, for increasing their capacity to deal with programs of economic and social development abroad.

II. To stimulate exchange with the students and teachers of other lands

Only when people know about—and care about—each other will nations learn to live together in harmony. I therefore propose that we:

1. Encourage the growth of school-to-school partnerships

Through such partnerships, already pioneered on a small scale, a U.S. school may assist the brick-and-mortar construction of a sister school in less-developed nations. The exchange can grow to include books and equipment, teacher and student visits.

To children, it can bring deep understanding and lasting friendships.

I recommend a goal of 1,000 school-to-school partnerships.

This program will be administered by the Peace Corps, in cooperation with AID, particularly its Partners of the Alliance Program. The chief cost will be borne by the voluntary contributions of the participating schools.

2. Establish an Exchange Peace Corps

Our Nation has no better ambassadors than the young volunteers who serve in 46 countries in the Peace Corps. I propose that we welcome similar ambassadors to our shores. We need their special skills and understanding, just as they need ours.

These "Volunteers to America" will teach their own language and culture in our schools and colleges. They will serve in community programs alongside VISTA volunteers. As our Peace Corps volunteers learn while they serve, those coming to the United States will be helped to gain training to prepare them for further service when they return home.

I propose an initial goal of 5,000 volunteers.

3. Establish an American education placement service

We have in the United States a reservoir of talent and good will not yet fully tapped:

school and college teachers eager to serve abroad;

professors and administrators who are retired or on sabbatical leave;

Peace Corps volunteers who desire further foreign service.

To encourage these men and women to assist in the developing nations and elsewhere, I recommend that we establish an American Education Placement Service in HEW.

It will act as an international recruitment bureau for American teachers, and will provide supplemental assistance for those going to areas of special hardship.

In time, I hope this service will lead to the development of a world teacher exchange—in which all nations may join to bring their classrooms into closer relationships with one another.

III. To assist the progress of education in developing nations

To provide direct support for those countries struggling to improve their education standards, I propose that we:

1. Enlarge AID programs of education assistance

In my message on foreign assistance, I directed AID to make a major effort in programs of direct educational benefit. These will emphasize teacher training—vocational and scientific education—construction of education facilities—specialized training in the United States for foreign students—and help in publishing badly needed textbooks.

2. Develop new techniques for teaching basic education and fighting illiteracy

Our own research and development in the learning process can be adapted to fit the needs of other countries. Modern technology and new communictions techniques have the power to multiply the resources available to a school system.

I am calling on HEW to support basic education research of value to the developing nations.

I am requesting AID to conduct studies and assist pilot projects for applying technology to meet critical education shortages.

3. Expand U.S. summer teaching corps

The Agency for International Development now administers programs for American teachers and professors who participate in summer workshops in less-developed countries. They serve effectively to support teacher-training in these countries. They also enrich their own teaching experience.

I propose this year that AID double the number of U.S. participants in the Summer Teacher Corps.

4. Assist the teaching of English abroad

Many of the newer nations have a vital need to maintain English as the language of international communication and national development. We must help meet this demand even as we extend the teaching of foreign languages in our own schools.

I have directed AID, supported by other agencies, to intensify its efforts for those countries which seek our help.

5. Establish binational educational foundations

We have at our disposal excess foreign currencies in a number of developing nations. Where conditions are favorable, I propose that significant amounts of these currencies be used to support binational educational foundations. Governed by leading citizens from the two nations, they would have opportunities much like those afforded major foundations in the United States to invest in basic educational development.

To the extent further currencies are created by our sales of agricultural commodities abroad, I propose that a portion be earmarked for educational uses, particularly to assist technical training in food production.

IV. To build new bridges of international understanding

The job of international education must extend beyond the classroom. Conferences of experts from many nations, the free flow of books and ideas, the exchange of works of science and imagination can enrich every citizen. I propose steps to:

1. Stimulate conferences of leaders and experts

I have directed every department and agency to support a series of seminars for representatives from every discipline and every culture to seek answers to the common problems of mankind.

We are ready to serve as host to international gatherings. I have therefore called on the Secretary of State and Attorney General to explore ways to remove unnecessary hindrances in granting visas to guests invited from abroad.

2. Increase the flow of books and other educational material

I recommended prompt passage of legislation to implement the Florence Agreement and thus stimulate the movement of books and other educational material between nations. This agreement was

In the few months since then, 44 million more children have come into the world. With them come more hunger—and more hope.

Since that time the gross national product of our Nation has passed the $700 billion mark.

The choice between light and darkness, between health and sickness, between knowledge and ignorance is not one that we can ignore.

The light we generate can be the brightest hope of history. It can illuminate the way toward a better life for all. But the darkness—if we let it gather—can become the final, terrible midnight of mankind.

The International Education and Health Acts of 1966 present an opportunity to begin a great shared adventure with other nations.

I urge the Congress to act swiftly for passage of both measures.

Our national interest warrants it.

The work of peace demands it.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

signed by representatives of the U.S. Government in 1959 and ratified by the Senate in 1960. This necessary congressional action is long overdue to eliminate duties and remove barriers for the importation of educational materials.

I also recommended that Congress implement the Beirut Agreement to permit duty-free entry of visual and auditory materials of an educational, scientific or cultural nature.

Finally, we must encourage American private enterprise to participate actively in educational exchange. I urge the Congress to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to permit improvements in the Informational Media Guarantee Program.

3. Improve the quality of U.S. schools and colleges abroad

We have a potentially rich resource in the American elementary and secondary schools and colleges overseas assisted by the Department of State and AID.

They should be showcases for excellence in education.

They should help make overseas service attractive to our own citizens.

They should provide close contact with students and teachers of the host country.

I request additional support to assist those institutions which meet these standards.

4. Create special programs for future leaders studying in the United States

There are some 90,000 foreign students now enrolled in U.S. institutions. Many of them will someday play leading roles in their own countries. We must identify and assist these potential leaders.

I recommend that HEW and AID provide grants to enrich their educational experience through special courses and summer institutes.

THE CHOICE WE MUST MAKE

We call on rich nations and poor nations to join with us—to help each other and to help themselves. This must be the first work of the world for generations to come.

For our part, the programs in International Education and Health I am recommending this year will total $524 million:

$354 million in the foreign assistance program.

$103 million in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department program.

$11 million in the Peace Corps program.

$56 million in the State Department cultural and education program.

As I indicated in my message on foreign assistance yesterday, these programs will be conducted in a manner consistent with our balance of payments policy.

We must meet these problems in ways that will strengthen free societies—and protect the individual right to freedom of choice.

Last fall, speaking to a gathering of the world's scholars at the Smithsonian Institution, I said: ". . . We can generate growing light in our universe—or we can allow the darkness to gather."

The Federal Government and the Universities

by Kenneth W. Mildenberger[1]

Now the Director of the Division of College and University Assistance of the United States Office of Education, Mr. Mildenberger organized and headed the Language Development Program of the National Defense Education Act before assuming his present position.

With the advent of the Second World War, United States military forces needed many personnel with working knowledge of the languages and cultures of the countries and areas of the world where combat and occupation forces were expected to operate. It quickly became apparent that in our society such persons were rare indeed, especially those familiar with the non-Western world. A frantic training program was developed which saw language and area training courses established in 55 universities under the Army specialized training program and at 16 universities under the civil affairs training program.

Our academic institutions were ill prepared to offer this limited-objective, highly utilitarian training even for Europe-bound personnel, and resources for non-Western language and area studies were almost nonexistent. War-time expediency and the relative novelty of course content dictated centralized prescription and control of these training activities, rather than institutional autonomy. It is a fact that the needed language instruction would never have got off the ground but for the propitious developmental leadership asserted by the intensive language program of the American Council of Learned Societies and mobilized into a Federal operation. Even the area curriculum was carefully detailed and ordained in Washington.

These short-lived activities were eliminated in the general demobilization that came swiftly with the end of the war; however, this experience had at least two results of lasting significance to non-Western studies. First, it gave prominence on the university campus to the concepts of intensive language training and of interdisciplinary area study. Neither idea was new, but circumstances had enabled a considerable number of vigorous teachers and scholars to develop and experiment with both concepts on a large scale. Second, the government had established that it looked upon the higher education enterprise as a national adjunct for non-Western knowledge and training.

If we could have returned to our life of the 1930's, these developments would have been relatively inconsequential. But normalcy was not allowed to return. After a few years of groping, the shape of the American role in world affairs began to unfold. The connotations of this new role are imbedded in our postwar vocabulary: Iron Curtain, cold war, Marshall Plan, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), Security Council, brush war, counterinsurgency, ideological offensive, technical

---

[1] © 1964, the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

assistance, underdeveloped nations, emerging nations, fallout, airlift, International Cooperation Administration (ICA), Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), National Security Agency (NSA), United States Information Agency (USIA), Food for Peace, Alliance for Progress, and many others.

Today, almost every Government agency is involved in some way in international activities, and nearly always they look to colleges and universities for some kind of help. Junior and staff personnel are recruited from the campus. Wisdom and knowledge are borrowed in the form of members of advisory committees and consultant panels. Professors are sought to go to Africa and Asia to develop a school program in English as a foreign language, to teach American studies, or to advise on an irrigation project. The Peace Corps offers contracts for short-term instructional programs for volunteers and for supervisory services abroad. The Agency for International Development contracts for the furnishing of technical assistance to developing nations. A detailed catalog of Government-university relations in the non-Western field would be large indeed.[1]

Since the Government regards the universities as a major national resource for personnel, research, and training in non-Western language and area studies, it is proper for the Government to assume some share of the financial responsibility for developing and renewing this resource which it calls upon increasingly for services. Non-Western studies are expensive and go against traditional concepts of a higher learning curriculum rooted in Western civilization. Alumni, trustees, and State legislatures have tended to show more curiosity than enthusiasm. In the years following the Second World War, the Carnegie Corp., the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Ford Foundation helped with carefully placed grants. But university resources were still badly strained by the effort to meet the challenge of non-Western studies.

Various Government agencies which seek services from higher education offer the universities a measure of development potential. Thus a technical assistance contract by the Agency for International Development, carefully placed at an appropriate university and responsibly administered by the university, does theoretically present the academic contractor with a variety of possibilities for enriching its language and area resources. Similar circumstances exist in mission-oriented international activities sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the Department of Defense, the U.S. Information Agency, the Peace Corps, the Public Health Service, and other Federal units.

However, such incidental and secondary possibilities, even when successfully accomplished, are no substitute for positive financial assistance solely for the purpose of strengthening academic resources. Before proceeding to the major programs of direct aid which the Government has provided in the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, it seems appropriate to discuss briefly two limited yet significant Federal activities which offer a degree of academic enrichment.

---

[1] The Department of State has issued a 28-page directory of Washington agency officials concerned with international programs. The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, has also provided a catalog, *The U.S. Ideological Effort: Government Agencies and Programs* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964).

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PERSONS

Since the Second World War the State Department has conducted substantial programs of educational exchange. The Fulbright Act of 1946 authorized use of foreign currency and credits obtained from the sale of U.S. war surpluses abroad for educational exchanges. The Smith-Mundt Act in 1948 authorized dollar appropriations. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 83–480) authorized proceeds from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for educational exchange activities. Most recently, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays Act) consolidated many of these activities and added some new ones.

Much evidence demonstrates the great effectiveness of these exchange programs in fostering their central statutory purpose, that of promoting "mutual understanding," with particular emphasis upon better understanding of the United States. Coincidentally, the programs have offered the potential for strengthening non-Western studies in American universities through opportunities for faculty and student travel abroad. From 1950 to 1963—before implementation of the Fulbright-Hays act—a total of 2,078 American students, lecturers, research scholars, teachers, and other specialists had gone to the Far East; 288 to Africa; 1,850 to the Near East and South Asia; and 1,425 to Latin America. However, as the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs reported to Congress in 1963, the exchange programs have suffered from uneven quality of American grantees and from lack of attention to planned involvement of existing U.S. university programs in language and area studies.

But thanks to new authorizations in the 1961 Fulbright-Hays Act there has been a notable trend toward activities aimed at strengthening language and area competence in American higher education. This is being accomplished through "special educational and cultural projects" abroad, financed largely by foreign currency. Significant examples from fiscal year 1963 records are: (1) a grant of $1,959,000 to the American Institute of Indian Studies in support of a research center in India for American scholars and advanced students; (2) a grant of $500,000 to the American Research Center in Egypt for a research center in Egypt; and (3) $24,057 to the American Association for Middle East Studies for a summer institute in social sciences and humanities in Israel for 15 American college faculty members. The summer institute or seminar device has been popular, and other such summer institutes or seminars might be listed if space permitted.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The Library of Congress is primarily a service arm of the legislative branch of the Government. On a limited basis it can provide research accommodations for scholars in non-Western studies. The most ambitious such service is the Hispanic Foundation, established in 1939, which is concerned with Latin American as well as Iberian studies. The foundation facilities the work of scholars visiting the Library, prepares *The Handbook of Latin American Studies*—an annual annotated reference bibliography—maintains an Archive of Hispanic Literature on Tape, and undertakes limited research projects of use to both the Government and the academic world.

In the context of this article, the most significant activity of the Library of Congress occurs in the implementation of section 104(n) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 83–480). In fiscal years 1962–1964 a total of nearly $2 million was authorized by Congress in foreign currencies, accrued from the sales of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities, for the acquisition of foreign books and their distribution to U.S. research libraries. Although the program at present is limited to acquisitions from six countries, it nevertheless constitutes a substantial flow of non-Western materials to university libraries. Eleven U.S. universities have arranged to receive books from India and Pakistan; 10 from Indonesia; 9 from Israel; nine from the United Arab Republic; and 10 from Burma.

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND NDEA

By the mid-1950's, responsible people in the Government were beginning to realize that university resources in non-Western studies were wholly inadequate to meet present and anticipated national needs. Precedents for Federal developmental aid to universities had already been firmly established in the fields of agriculture, science, health, and medicine, and now some measure of Government assistance to language and area instruction seemed essential. The U.S. Office of Education assumed responsibility for preparing legislation, and by the spring of 1957 a draft bill existed dealing primarily with assistance to strengthen language instruction, later to be amended wisely to include adjunct support to area studies. It is significant that the preparation of this legislative program occurred before the first sputnik (Oct. 4, 1957), but it became a part of the large omnibus measure labeled the National Defense Education Act, enacted by an aroused 85th Congress and signed by President Eisenhower on September 2, 1958.)

Title VI of the NDEA, the language development program, thus became the Central Government mechanism for strengthening non-Western resources in American universities. During the 6 years since enactment, this authority has provided $34 million to higher education for non-Western academic developments; $11 million for expanding and improving instruction at language and area centers; $7 million for research, studies and creation of teaching materials; and $16 million for student stipends. A fourth program of title VI has spent $33 million for higher education institutes to improve the teaching of modern languages in the public schools, but the concern there is mainly with West European languages.

Language and area centers

Through contracts providing up to 50 percent of Federal support for new and expanded activities, 34 higher learning institutions have strengthened instruction in 55 Centers—East Asia, 11 centers; Slavic and East Europe, 10; Middle East, 8; South Asia, 7; Latin America, 7; Sub-Saharan Africa, 5; southeast Asia, 3; Uralic-Altaic regions, 2; Asian-Slavic, 2. Federal funds may be used for instructional salaries, acquisition and servicing of library materials, conferences, and travel. About half the financial support has implemented area studies instruction. The number of teachers of non-Western languages at the centers has increased from under 80 to over 200, and the number of languages taught has risen from 20 to 76. Enrollments have more than trebled. Some 20 centers annually offer summer programs in intensive language study, usually equivalent to a full year's course work.

Stipends

Awards are made for advanced study of modern foreign languages—except French, German, and Italian—and related area studies. A limited number of postdoctoral awards have been given, and a growing program of undergraduate stipends for summer intensive language study has been gratifyingly successful. But most awards are to graduate students. Stipends normally include tuition and fees, maintenance allowance for student and dependents, and roundtrip travel from home to institution. Study must be in a program of a U.S. university.

Advanced graduate students may go abroad to do research on dissertations, but the law permits neither study at a foreign university nor the costs of foreign travel. Awards are for a maximum of an academic year plus summer study, and they are renewable. Generally 800 to 1,000 students are supported annually in graduate study. All stipend-holders must, under the law, be engaged in advanced language study, although about two-thirds are actually majors in a social science or humanistic discipline other than language. Successful applicants have gone to nearly 60 universities, but about 65 percent have chosen to study at one of the 55 NDEA centers. During 1963–1964, 100 recipients were studying Arabic; 120, Chinese; 64, Hindi-Urdu; 80, Japanese; 60, Portuguese; 135, Russian; 96, Spanish; and 247 were studying 52 other languages. It is especially important to understand that these individuals are not enrolled in utilitarian training programs. They are superior quality graduate students, selected in a national competition, engaged in academic studies of the highest order. Among them are many who will inherit major non-Western responsibilities in both our academic enterprise and our Government.

Research and instruction

A great variety of projects have received support under contract, mainly for the purpose of extending and strengthening instruction in the languages of the non-Western world. Central to this effort has been the production of language-teaching materials. Between 1959 and 1964, contracts were arranged for the development of materials for 115 non-Western languages including 20 linguistic analyses, 84 basic courses, 71 readers, 34 dictionaries, and 33 reference grammars. By 1964, 180 different textbooks or other specialized materials in 56 languages had been completed and were in use. In addition, some 22 area-studies volumes have been supported, such as handbooks for Iran, Indonesia, and Mongolia. Such research and development is essential in order to provide depth and variety of instruction for the growing numbers of students turning to non-Western studies.

Because the NDEA support is aimed at encouraging language and area development within the context of academic purposes, every effort has been made to avoid Government interference with the integrity of the higher education enterprise and its educational objectives. John W. Gardner, [former] president of the Carnegie Corp., has commented in regard to title VI: "The NDEA programs respect the autonomy of the universities and enjoy excellent relations with them." Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, stated in the foreword of an ACE study of NDEA centers that "the Federal Government has provided its share of the financing of language and area centers without impairing the autonomy of the institutions receiving the funds; in short, Federal funds have been given without Federal control." A joint statement by directors of all NDEA centers has declared: "Thanks to the statesmanlike and e[illegible]cationally informed way in which title VI of the act has been adm[illegible]istered by the language development branch, Government funds ha[illegible] made it possible for the universities to make a major contributi[illegible] to the Nation's language resources while preserving their own freedom of action and maintaining their own distinctive character."

Support for travel and study

The NDEA lacked one critical authorization, full financial support for travel and study in foreign areas by advanced students and faculty. Several unsuccessful efforts were made to add such a provision to title VI, but the Congress in 1961 included the necessary language in section 102 (b) (6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act. An Executive order in 1962 delegated this section to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where it is administered by the Office of Education. Specifically, the Section authorizes

> promoting modern foreign language training and area studies in U.S. schools, colleges, and universities by supporting visits and study in foreign countries by teachers and prospective teachers in such schools, colleges and universities for the purpose of improving their skill in languages and their knowledge of the culture of the people of those countries, and by financing visits by teachers from those countries to the United States for the purpose of participating in foreign language training and area studies in U.S. schools, colleges, and universities.

The wording is simple and direct, and the single purpose of enhancing American language and area studies is clear. What is of crucial importance is that dollar appropriations are authorized so that travel is not restricted to those countries where the United States possesses credits in foreign currencies. The first Office of Education university awards in this program were for the summer of 1964 and academic year 1964–65. Eighty grants were authorized for graduate students training to be college teachers of non-Western languages and area studies—cost: $454,400; and forty grants were for faculty at NDEA-supported language and area centers—cost: $460,000. Faculty grants cover travel for the recipient, an allowance of $100 per month each for up to four dependents, and an amount in lieu of salary, up to $15,000. No effort has been made yet under this authority to finance visits by foreign teachers to augment instruction in university language and area programs.

From the foregoing it is obvious that the government has entered into a substantial partnership with the universities in the development of non-Western studies.[2] Any partnership is a continually evolving relationship, and its success depends upon sincere efforts at mutual accommodation. It is not possible here to enter into the involved subject of likely or desirable alterations and enlargements of this relationship. We should be mindful, however, that the evolving relationship is at all times dependent upon a viable interaction between the private sector, the Congress, and the executive branch of government. ("The Non-Western World in Higher Education," The *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1964)

---

[2] In October 1964 the National Defense Education Act was amended in one of the last acts of the 88th Congress. This extends support for certain programs through the academic year 1968–69. The authorization for title VI of the NDEA, which includes language and area centers, national defense foreign language fellowships and research and studies, was increased by $5 million, from $8 million to $13 million for the fiscal year 1965. This amount increases annually until 1968 when it reaches $18 million.

THE ROLE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The Present World Challenge to Higher Education

***by Claude S. Phillips, Jr.**[*]*

A former Fulbright scholar in India, Mr. Phillips has been director of international studies at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo since 1959 and is now director of the university's Institute of International and Area Studies.

The world of 23 years ago was deceptively simple to Westerners, although it appeared sufficiently complex and even grim to most people who thought about it at the time. The center of the world for most of us was Europe and, as in World War I, it seemed divided between democratic and totalitarian systems. The non-Western world had intruded itself into our world of 1940, to be sure, but we could fix the old labels to describe the various parts of it: Japan was with the totalitarians, China was with the democracies, and the rest of it was made up of colonies which belonged to our allies and were naturally on the democratic side. We could ignore the fact that to an Ibo, or a Persian, or a Hindu, or even a Japanese, Europe was not the center of the world. Nor did they see the world in democratic versus totalitarian categories.

Our ethnocentrism caused us to see the world in neat categories in 1940, and the temptation still exists for us to view it so today. The difference today lies in the fact that we cannot get away with it any more—if we ever could. The very nature of the world has changed. I do not speak only of the control of atomic weapons, the population tensions, the widespread hunger and disease, or even of the cold war which is merely a contemporary term for past clashes of national interests accompanied by an arms race. I refer instead to the scores of new decision makers on the world scene. I refer to the fact that peoples we formerly ignored or merely tolerated are now sharing the world's power with us. I refer to the fact that we in the West no longer initiate world events; more and more we find ourselves merely reacting to them. I refer to the fact that the dynamic social movements of the second half of the 20th century are no longer centered in the United States nor even in the West, except perhaps for the European Economic Community.

The powerful force of nationalism, population pressures, social experimentation, the transformation of whole societies, the great clash of ideas, all are occurring today in the non-Western world. It is in the non-West that men are reexamining anew the meaning of man and life. The objective of the good life, which we claim to have defined for the world, is being now vigorously pursued, with the most dogged

---

[*] The Educational Record, July 1963. Copyright 1963, American Council on Education.

determination, in the non-Western world. It is here that man is yet willing to rock the boat, to plan and execute revolutions, to challenge the *status quo*. It is here that the concept of the dignity of man is being reexamined to see why it should not apply to all nations, to all races, to all men. As our own complacent society tends more and more to approximate the lonely crowd, the peoples of the non-Western world are sloughing off centuries of conformity and despair. The specter that is haunting Europe and America is the hope that we, often unwittingly, helped to rekindle in the mind of man beyond Europe.

The challenges to this country have been especially formidable. When we spoke at the end of World War II, others listened, acquiesced, or discussed with us—even the Soviet Union did so. Today when we speak, the prime minister of some state unheard of 10 years ago, with exotic costume, unfamiliar accent, and strange metaphors, not only disagrees with us to our face, but he denounces our *status quo* attitudes and demands of us a reexamination of our whole world involvement. While we weakly ask the right to settle peacefully and slowly the plight of our colored people, whole nations of colored people are being catapulted to statehood. As we settle down to enjoy our good life, inexorable demands are being made that we share it. Just as we have finally come to embrace our friends in Europe, new and powerful pressures outside of Europe are asking us to choose between them and our newfound brothers. Just as feeble hope appears that Western civilization is beginning to heal the diseases that caused two horrible wars in this century, new cultures are rising to the scene with which we must begin anew the process of accommodation.

'Tis a new world indeed. Does it presage the decline of the West, as Walter Lippmann claims? One thing seems clear: If the West is not declining in absolute terms, it certainly is declining in relative terms as other centers of opinion and power rise in the world.

What does all this mean for higher education, even all education, in the United States? If nothing else, it compels us to raise again the question of the purpose of college and university education, and to redefine our concept of the educated man. Primarily by this term "the educated man" I think we mean one who has some appreciation of man's sojourn on this earth and the great challenges man has faced from the physical world and from the problems of living together. We certainly have assumed that the ultimate objective of college education is to create the educated man, no matter how often in practice we seem to miss the target.

I recently met a British professor of classics who asserted that the true university has no social functions other than creating the educated man; that is, the university's search for, and teaching about, truth must never be conditioned by national goals or societal needs. It seems significant to me that this same professor had established a department in a university college in an underdeveloped African country which had six lecturers teaching Latin, Greek, and ancient Western history while the department of modern languages had two lecturers, one each in French and German..

We may well question whether any of the great universities of the past even approximated the ideal of a university freed from social obligations. Even those which appeared free of national purposes were not free from cultural limitations. Western civilization was their milieu, Western knowledge their tools, Western man their concern.

The American university, however, has not restricted itself to a narrow definition of its purpose. In 1960 the Committee on the University and World Affairs asked the question: What is the appropriate role of the university in a free society? The answer was given in the following succinct paragraph:

> The American university has a public purpose, whether in domestic or world affairs, founded upon the traditions of American society and the heritage of other great universities in history. The purpose is the advancement of human welfare through the enlargement and communication of knowledge in a spirit of free inquiry. At its best, the university frees individual minds as it develops competence for the higher pursuits of life. It widens the horizons of the nation's judgment while supplying skills essential to the nation's tasks. As part of a larger community of scholarship, it also cooperates in an effort to enlarge man's understanding of the world and thereby to promote the welfare of mankind.[1]

A Fund for the Advancement of Education report spelled out the relationship of universities and society more sharply:

> Since educational institutions depend for their existence on the moral and financial support of the society in which they dwell, and since society in turn depends on its schools and colleges for its continued growth and development, the relationships of education to society involve a host of important problems.[2]

While many universities in other countries see two functions for universities—teaching and scholarship:

> The American university characteristically adds a third form of service to the society that nurtures it—activities such as professional training, consultation, extension work, and continuing education, serving directly the broader society beyond the campus.[3]

We have, therefore, integrated the search for truth with particular needs of the society, although we can deplore the fact that the recent emphases which we have placed on industrial and military needs raise serious doubts about how those needs are defined and determined. Part of the difficulty may lie in the fact that the universities have not sufficiently recognized the social world of the last 17 years. We might well ask whether our search for truth and our concern for social needs have really reflected the nature of the contemporary world. Indeed, we must ask whether the horizon of our concept of a university has widened so as to embrace a truly worldwide concept of truth and a truly worldwide spectrum of social needs.

There is no doubt that the United States has responded to the postwar world on a scale of involvement that would have been unthinkable in 1940. Our first reaction to the contemporary world, and the precondition for the others, was a massive social convulsion as we threw off isolationism and began to realize that ours is but one society in a world of hundreds. Although we still have recurrences of the old disease, by and large our national health is improving. In fact, historians in the next century will no doubt mark the change in the United States as one of the significant results of World War II.

At first our interest was primarily with Europe, then we broadened it to include Asia, then the Middle East, then Africa, and finally Latin America as one crisis followed another. Korea, Vietnam, Kashmir, Suez, the Congo, and Cuba are not merely place names on a map but symbols of our new world. Our responses have been with soldiers and money, with advisers and administrators, with engineers and scientists, with technicians and physicians, with scholars and teachers. From the Marshall plan and Point Four to the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress, America has responded. As the Council on Foreign Relations has pointed out:

---

[1] Committee on the University and World Affairs, *The University and World Affairs* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1961), p. 9.

[2] *A Report for 1957–59* (New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1959), p. 45.

[3] *The University and World Affairs*, p. 10.

> The impact of America on most other nations is made not solely or even primarily by official diplomacy but by the massive contact between peoples and cultures that is characteristic of this age: by the expansion of trade and other economic relations; by high-level visits and tourism on a grand scale; by the influence of the press, radio, and motion pictures; by the exchange of professors and students, books, and ideas across national frontiers; and by the way in which America lives up to the ideals which it sets for itself, for example in respect for human rights and for the principle of nondiscrimination.

The universities have played a large role in America's new world interests. Apart from their traditional role in supplying diplomats, they have supplied professors as skilled advisers, instituted faculty and student exchanges, and established intimate links with sister institutions in the developing countries. Universities and colleges which had not made specific efforts to involve themselves in world affairs have discovered that they were involved anyhow as their graduates by the thousands found careers in Government and business which led them into contact with the non-Western world. More recently, the colleges have witnessed the scattering of their graduates by the hundreds to Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the Peace Corps, most of them with little or no preparation from their alma mater. Suddenly it was obvious that it was not only the big, rich universities which were involved—we were all involved.

There are today over half a million Americans overseas. The overwhelming majority of these people are products of American colleges and universities, that is, our educated men and women. The fact that we really did not intend for them to teach school in Uganda, advise farmers in Pakistan, or sell Chevrolets in Nigeria is now immaterial. They are already there. Some of them are teaching students through the student's second, not his first, language; others are teaching subjects never dreamed of in college, from the history of Yorubaland to British English. Some are building dams without machinery, and plowing fields without plows. Some are selling American luxury items to the few rich, thus draining valuable dollars from the underdeveloped country. Some are preaching Western religion. Some represent our labor unions. Some are seeking adventure. Some are there to study and learn. Some just want to help. All, however, speak for America, and most represent the results of our colleges and universities.

Furthermore, the number of such Americans abroad is bound to increase. We must ask the question therefore: Have we done all that our search for truth and our social obligations dictate? Prof. Gerard Mangone of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University has conceded that college catalogs will reveal the increased awareness of world affairs over the last few years as new emphases on area studies, international affairs, and foreign languages have been added. But, he adds:

> On balance, however, it is not enough. The American school curriculum, at all levels, has failed to match the sweep of American interests—political, economic, and cultural—around the world. Agencies like the Defense Department or the International Cooperation Administration are still fumbling with awkward recruitment techniques, partial training programs, and little evaluation in their overseas programs. Churches confess to the need for "an entirely new type of missionary activity to be developed alongside the traditional mode." And American business has gone no further than the most elementary preparation of its employees for living abroad.[4]

In a similar vein, the Committee on the University and World Affairs (established at the request of the State Department, and chaired by J. L. Morrill, former president of the University of Minnesota) agreed that:

> In the postwar years American universities, responding to the Nation's new involvement in world affairs, have taken on many new and expanded activities. These include new courses on Asia, Africa, and the Soviet Union, and United States relations with them; research on economic, political and social development of the newly independent nations; foreign students in large numbers; and special oversea projects to help build and strengthen educational institutions in other countries.[5]

Even so, the committee concluded, the responses so far "have been largely sporadic and unplanned." It was necessary, therefore, for the committee (whose report came out as recently as December 1960) to recommend that:

> *All American institutions of higher learning should make studies of world affairs an important and permanent dimension of their undergraduate programs;* [and that] *"All American universities should improve the competence of their graduate and professional schools to teach and to conduct research on international aspects of their disciplines and professions."*[6]

It further recommended that:

> *Many universities (more than at present) should become diversified centers of strength* to train specialists in world affairs for careers in teaching and other professions, government and business; to undertake research; to exercise leadership in language-training and linguistics; to prepare teaching materials for all levels of education; and to open the perspectives of scholarship to other institutions and to adult citizens in their communities.[7]

These conclusions suggest that the universities have not yet really begun to face the future. To be sure, a handful of universities for the most part the wealthy and famous ones, have begun to face the challenges. But most of our universities and colleges, equally charged with creating the educated man, have hardly responded at all. We are still graduating hundreds of thousands of youths each spring whose college experience did not involve them in any way in the study of non-Western man. Many others were touched with the non-Western world only perfunctorily in courses with a Western focus, for example, in sections dealing with Western expansionism and colonialism, or the impact of Islam on southern Europe. Only a small number in a few institutions have ever studied non-Western peoples for the purpose of understanding *their* cultures.

Such a state of affairs hardly does credit to the mid-20th century institution of higher education. Furthermore, it reveals a lack of concern for the university of today and tomorrow. Many of us who are professors may live into the 21st century; most of our students surely will. As we begin to think of the world of the next century, we are automatically forced to think of the role of the university in preparing for it. Our own nationalism requires it because of the extent of our involvement in the whole world. Our Western heritage requires it because its rich and varied traditions are being examined and found wanting by men of other cultures. Our concept of democracy requires it because it is being challenged more and more vigorously from the burgeoning new states. Our economy requires it because we are being asked as never before to share our wealth with the world. Our religious and philosophical values require it because peoples with different values are saying they can create our good life without adopting our beliefs about man, nature, or God. But more than anything else, our search for truth demands it because we must regard man as a creature of the world. This is not a tautology, for in the past when we studied man, we looked at Western man; others, embracing most of the human race, were largely outside our concern.

---

[4] Mangone, "New Americans in Old Societies," *Antioch Review*, winter 1958, p. 410.
[5] *The University and World Affairs*, p. 2.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
[7] *Loc. cit.*

As long as the university's challenge is placed in the context of its social obligations, solutions are apparent, if not easy to implement: something can be added to the traditional offerings, and a few professors interested in non-Western studies can be scattered among the faculty. But when the challenge is placed in the context of the university's role as a searcher for truth, we suddenly see that something is missing. A new dimension is called for; to borrow a phrase from the Committee on the University and World Affairs, "the pioneering of new academic traditions" is needed. What is missing, I believe, is a world view which permeates the faculty of a university as fully as the concept of academic freedom. A world perspective will require that every course, every study involving man as a creative, social, behaving being will be set in terms of humanity. What is called for is an attitude, a *Weltanschauung*, that views the particular study of man and his ideas from the context of universal man. From such a perspective, curriculum changes will come almost automatically.

Let me be clear, however. This is not a call for everybody to become a specialist on some phase of the non-Western world. This is not a criticism of traditional specialization with a Western focus. We would do cruel harm to our educated man if we neglect his appreciation of his own culture to acquaint him with others. No matter what his concern with other cultures, he will always be first a representative of the one in which he was reared, and the peoples of other cultures will always regard him as a spokesman of, and probably for, the culture of his birth. But what we must accept now is that no man, no educated man, lives exclusively in his own culture, not even if he never leaves his country.

I am always amazed by one of the arguments raised against this concept which runs as follows: "How can we take the time to teach our students about the non-Western world when they do not even understand their own culture?" The weakness in this argument breaks down in this one simple, but profoundly significant, fact: there are no longer, if there ever were, self-contained, mutually exclusive cultures in the world. The myth that this was so stemmed directly from the Western domination of the others. No human being in the world today escapes contact with, or influence from, cultures other than his own. In fact, part of his own culture today is its reaction to others. Just as no man is an island, today we can say that not culture stands alone. There are only self-centered, no self-contained cultures. And the challenge of the university which prepares educated men to live in the 21st century rests on the awareness of this simple fact.

While the fact may be simple, the change resulting from its acceptance would be revolutionary. In the first place, we would be forced to test generalizations about human behavior against the behavior of all men everywhere; rather than merely against behavior in the West. Prof. Ralph Braibanti pointed this out clearly a few years ago when he spoke of the plight of the political scientist "interested mainly in law and gadgets, armed with public opinion surveys and work-flow charts" who went to Asia to study. He said:

> Our legalist will look for the laws governing men, but he will find only men ruling men. He will look for objective due process; he will find intuitive justice based on a complex of feelings. Our administrator will search for a focal center of authority; he will find the most baffling kind of corporate responsibility. He will insist on promotion by merit, but will find advancement by age and social status. Even our theorist looking for mobility and equality will find philosophies of hierarchy and inequality. He will look for separation of the secular and the sacerdotal: he will find neither such practice nor even the idea.[8]

Dare I mention the problems that beset other disciplines when they encounter the non-Western World: the philosopher who has to see nature anew; the historian who has to reconstruct history without documents; the economist who has to gage economic returns without statistics of past performances; the sociologist who has to distinguish between a nation and a tribe.

Second, and stemming from the first, a world view will lead us all into comparative studies. If our generalizations based on Western man must be suspended until corroborated against the behavior of all men, then we must begin to study the behavior of all men, even if perfunctorily. Robert M. Hutchins has justified the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, which brings eminent scholars from all fields to Santa Barbara for the exchange of ideas, in the following suggestive terms:

> If we have done nothing else we have shown how narrow are the usual channels of thought in this age of specialization. We have reached a point where a man with a good mind, superior education, and a deserved reputation in his own field may be appallingly ignorant of the world—and it is the world we must now be concerned with.[9]

Third, a world view will require us to think again of the educated man, the product of our undergraduate colleges. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching recently noted that the numerous courses with an international focus "make quite a splash in the college catalog but no splash at all in the lives of most students." A world view finds such a situation intolerable. While countless millions of human beings (because of ignorance and/or the absence of free information) will never know the real world which involves all of mankind, the American educated man must know, if his Government, through its present political processes, is expected to react in an informed manner. This pragmatic argument (which admittedly ignores the question of the scientific value to know) defends the thesis that an education which focuses only on Western culture is less than half an education, because it encompasses less than half of mankind and only one of many cultures in the world. Whatever may be common to mankind, their cultures—their values, institutions, aspirations, national identities, friends, enemies, the very "pictures in their minds"—are not. And it is the contact, the accommodation, and clash of whole cultures, not merely states, which typifies the world of man. A curriculum which ignores a world view in order to buttress an already exaggerated ethnocentricism surely cannot be justified by any scholar concerned either with truth or social needs.

---

[8] Unpublished speech.
[9] Quoted in Harry Ashmore, "The Thinking Man's Shelter," *Esquire*, April 1962, p. 111.

Finally, a world view enriches the faculty, the students, and the community of the university. It furthers cross-cultural contacts such as student and faculty exchanges, comparative research and study, and the sharing of art and beliefs. While it may be true that familiarity often breeds contempt, ignorance breeds an even more dangerous reaction for the 20th century—indifference.

A world view asks that a university be merely what the name implies—universal in focus: as it studies matter from the atom to the cosmos, it must study man from the individual to humanity. We as professors would be the first to defend the principle of objectivity, no matter how defined, as essential to the search for truth. Yet as we add up the number of our courses and the number of our professors, and discover how little we concern ourselves with the whole world of man, can we say our search for truth is objective?

I have spoken frequently of the university's obligations to meet societal needs, but have tried not to minimize its obligations also to the search for truth. Who more than the university professor should have the objectivity, the skill, and the knowledge to look to the future and point out the trends of our time? Even if one ignores humanitarian factors and social needs, how can the modern social scientist or humanist ignore the rapid population growth of our time and its myriad relationships with economic development, national state boundaries, human dissatisfactions, and so-called underpopulated areas? How can we ignore the obvious fact that three score new states, rooted in non-Western traditions, are determined to wield an ever-increasing voice in the world? Does it take special insights to recognize that in one generation a hundred restless states, dissatisfied, dynamic, and demanding, will have permanently changed the social world? Ignore the non-Western World and you lose the explanation for one of the chief incentives for European unification as well as the explanation for the wholly new United Nations which has emerged in the last 3 years. Can one fail to see that as Asia, Africa, and Latin America become producers of manufactured products, new trade complexes among themselves and with the old states will emerge? As atomic know-how spreads to China, Egypt, Israel, then Pakistan, India, Nigeria, Ghana, and beyond, can one fail to see the new significance?

These and similar trends prompted one eminent scholar, F. S. C. Northrop, in a provocative monograph entitled *The Taming of the Nations*,[10] to scan the future and see a ray of hope in science as a unifying factor in man's struggle to survive. His tool for such a task was a world view, and Western culture was meaningful for his purposes only when placed in the context of world cultures. The point is not whether he was right, but that he was pursuing a proper objective of scholarship. The social scientist's concern for truth, his concern for testing generalizations against all human behavior, his concern for predicting action based on present knowledge, all demand a world perspective. And the educated man, one of the main objects of the university, needs that same perspective to deal with his world. So once again our concern for scholarship and our search for truth become intertwined with the needs of our students and, in the broader context, the needs of society.

---

[10] New York: Macmillan Co., 1952.

It seems to me that we are compelled to agree with the editorial of the *New York Herald Tribune* of May 9, 1959:

> In the age of emerging Asian and African nations, familiarity with Western culture is no longer enough for the educated man. The ethnic provincialism of the West that sufficed in the white man's world has been overrun by history. But our colleges and universities have not all responded to the rapidly changing times * * *

Equally compelling was the observation of Louis T. Benezet, then president of Colorado College, on October 6, 1960:

> There is going to be one kind of education in the future that will suffice. That is an education which prepares people to live in a world community. We might as well begin making the marriage now.[11]

It seems to me that every institution of higher learning in the United States is now challenged to examine anew its purpose for existence. Particularly, we must look again at our freshman and sophomore courses, the primary area of general education. Is general education in the social sciences adequate when it treats non-Western studies as a mere addendum to traditional Western studies? More important, is it now necessary to give as much attention, and in as great detail, to most of the people of the world as we give to Western man in our general education? Stated differently, does the educated man (as teacher, lawyer, businessman, politician, scientist, or any other professional) need to have an understanding of mankind before he can be said to have even a rudimentary grounding in social sciences and humanities?

These questions pose fantastic challenges to most colleges and universities. Honest answers would often require a revamping of the whole 4-year curriculum. Dozens of courses would have to be rejustified. New courses and faculty to teach them would have to be added. Vested interests of the traditional emphasis would have to be accommodated. Governing boards and legislatures would have to be reeducated. But these are the results of any profound challenge to tradition.

In closing, I would suggest that the only argument which would deny the current challenge to higher education would have to be made as follows: The world has *not* changed in the last few years; the United States is *not* more deeply involved than before; non-Western peoples are less significant to either scholarship or survival than they have been; international affairs do *not* loom any larger in our life than in the past; our university graduates are *not* any more involved in the world beyond Europe than they ever were; the rise of new states and the awakening of old cultures do *not* make any difference to the kind of education we are called on to provide; and the traditional education with a Western focus is *all* that the educated man needs. Such an argument cannot stand in the fact of empirical evidence. If the reverse is true, if a self-study is called for, if we must begin to ask difficult questions, then I suggest that we keep this thought before us: Institutional mediocrity results from a university's doing less than its capacity permits to create the educated man, for it means that new challenges are met *only* with traditional answers or else by denials that the new challenges really exist. (*The Educational Record*, July 1963.)

---

[11] Unpublished speech.

The University in Our Civilization

by John W. Gardner

In an address given in 1959 to the annual meeting of the American Council on Education, Mr. Gardner urged U.S. universities to debate their role in society. Then president of the Carnegie Corp. of New York, Mr. Gardner in 1965 became Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The role of the universities is undergoing a remarkable change. They are being thrust into a position of great responsibility in our society—a position more central, more prominent, more crucial to the life of the society than academic people ever dreamed possible.

I limit the generalization to "universities" solely for convenience in exposition. Some of my comments will apply equally well to all institutions of higher education. But a good deal of what I say will have its clearest relevance for the universities.

Lyman Bryson says that universities may be the only instrumentalities in our society which are adequately fitted to deal with what he calls the "strategy of culture." He means that they are the only ones equipped to think fruitfully about our past and our future as a civilization, the only ones capable of saying which of our social institutions are in decay and which are struggling to be born. There is much evidence to support his contention. With increasing frequency, the rest of the nation is turning to the universities for guidance and giving them unprecedented opportunities to play a formative role in our national life.

I suspect that the rise of the universities to a position of leadership in our society has occurred more rapidly than university people themselves have been able to assimilate. Nothing is more firmly fixed in the minds of academic people than the conviction that they are swimming in the quiet waters of life—observing, but not a part of, the great turbulent mainstream of society. They recognize, of course, that more and more fishermen from the big world are dangling bait before the fattest of the faculty trout; but it is hard for university people to recognize that their own institutions are very much a part of the mainstream today.

The changing role of the university is most clearly seen in the scope and importance of its traffic with the rest of society; and that is what I propose to discuss. I recognize that the university must give overriding priority to its intramural tasks of teaching and research; and outside activities, if improperly pursued, may be a handicap rather than a help in this respect. Nothing that I say here is intended to contradict that truth. But the outside activities of the university have experienced such extraordinary growth that they merit serious attention in their own right.

The best evidence of how far the universities have come in their involvement in the world of affairs is the extent to which everyone takes that involvement for granted. No one raises an eyebrow anymore at the news that the Federal Government is putting hundreds of millions of dollars a year into university-directed research. No one is amazed to learn that the location of a major industrial research facility was determined by its proximity to major universities. It does not startle anyone to learn that the fiscal procedures of one of our States have been completely redesigned by a team of university specialists. It occasions no public comment when the prime minister of a crisis-ridden Asian nation turns to a U.S. university for help in government reorganization.

Though the present administration has not shown the same open fondness for a "brain trust" as did earlier administrations, the parade of professors to and through Washington continues. Indeed the role of the professors may be more potent than ever simply because it is now so familiar that it is neither discussed nor criticized. There are probably more former academic people in Congress now than there were in the days of the New Deal. I made this point to a professor the other day, and his only comment was, "Heaven help the executive branch!"

There is no likelihood that the trend toward university involvement with the rest of society will reverse itself. Of course, some academic people believe that the practical demands which society places on the university are not a blessing but a snare. They would rather be let alone, and their sentiment is well summed up in a Latin American saying "No quiero el queso sino salir de la ratonera," which means "I don't want the cheese, I just want to get out of the trap."

But the critics who object to the university being entangled in the practical affairs of the world cannot hope to reverse a position that Americans have taken for almost two centuries. As early as the 18th century such men as Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Rush were asserting that education must serve the community in a host of practical ways. In the 19th century it was not only the land-grant colleges and state universities that championed university involvement in practical affairs. Such men as Charles Eliot and Daniel C. Gilman shared the conviction. Alfred North Whitehead expressed the prevailing American view when he said, "Celibacy does not suit a university. It must mate itself with action."

The interesting question is not whether the university will be active in the world of affairs—it will!—but whether in meeting the demands upon it, it will exhibit qualities of statesmanship or function as a sort of badly organized supermarket.

A tremendous array of activities has been allowed to develop without any adequate guiding philosophy. When a Government agency with money to spend approaches a university it can usually purchase almost any service it wants. And many institutions still follow the odd practice of listing funds so received as gifts. They not only do not look a gift horse in the mouth, they don't even pause to note whether it is a horse or a boa constrictor.

The direct involvement of the universities in the practical affairs of the community may be thought of as occurring at three levels. First, there is the independent activity of individual faculty members who devote their spare time to consulting work or to part-time nonacademic employment. If this does not interfere with teaching and requires no administrative overhead, it is not usually a matter in which the university wishes to exercise administrative influence. From this standpoint, the university is a reservoir of high-talent manpower to be drawn on by the rest of society.

The hazards are obvious—chiefly the danger of interference with the primary objectives of the university. But there is much to be gained if first-class minds from the universities apply themselves to the critical problems of the Nation and the world. They might conceivably move those problems toward solution. And the academic world is certain to be enriched, as Emerson asserted in the *American Scholar*, by the intermingling of reflection and action.

There is another advantage to be weighed. In a world in which talent is increasingly constrained by the fetters of organizational life, the university man may emerge as a uniquely and valuably free spirit, independent in action and judgment, flexibly available for a wide range of assignments. Blessed with these advantages, he may come to play a central innovative role in an increasingly inflexible society. Indeed, I suspect that those academic people whose relationship to the world is one of withdrawal and return are going to produce the moving ideas of our time.

Philosopher-kings there never have been and never will be, except in the platonic imagination. And yet every man who thinks seriously and consecutively about the problems of society finds himself groping toward some such reconciling of action and reflection. My view is that though this will never happen, we can come as close to it as reality allows by maintaining good communication and open highways between the citadels of power and the citadels of reflection.

So much for the first level of the university's direct involvement in the practical affairs of the society.

We move to a second level when we turn to those activities in which the university must take an administrative interest—because they involve the university in some explicit responsibility, or require partial university support, or threaten to consume a lot of faculty time and energy. In this category, for example, would fall research grants involving substantial amounts of university personnel, space or funds. As the university's involvement moves from trivial to substantial, the administration has no choice but to ask with increasing rigor the following kinds of questions.

1. Is the proposed activity compatible with the aims of the university?
2. Where does it stand on a list of university priorities?
3. Does it impair (or strengthen) the university's capacity to carry out its central mission?
4. Is it something that a university is uniquely fitted to do, something that only a university can do?
5. Will it result in growth or strengthening for the university itself?

We would be better off today if university administrations had asked these questions about a number of activities now in progress.

Now let us turn to the third level of university involvement in affairs outside the university. At the first level, the university makes no commitments—it simply allows faculty members to function as individuals. At the second level the university does make commitments but the commitment is no more than to provide certain kinds of support and to handle each separate project with technical competence. The character of the third level will be grasped when we recognize that in some fields the university has a continuing institutional responsibility which requires that it bring to these fields not only technical competence on ad hoc assignments but continuity of interest and concern.

Consider, for example, the role of the universities in precollege education. The uninformed observer might suppose that this was too close to home to be regarded as an outside activity, but you and I know that up until 2 years ago the university as a community knew a good deal more about the mistresses of Louis XIV than it did about the American high school. But events of recent years have taught us that the welfare of higher education is inseparably linked to the quality and vigor of the elementary and secondary schools.

Today significant work is being done in the universities on the development of courses and textbooks at the precollege level. Many universities are running summer institutes for gifted high school students. Many have greatly strengthened the kinds of refresher and advanced courses they offer for teachers. Some universities have developed significant relationships with local school systems.

But this activity is still spotty. It is still not widely enough understood that the university community as a whole has an authentic continuing responsibility in precollege education. I am not suggesting that they assume imperialistic control over the precollege level. They could not do so if they wished to. But it is certain that one of the most powerful guarantees of the continued intellectual vitality and standards of precollege education would be a serious continuing interest on the part of the whole university community.

I would suggest that another area in which the universities have a continuing responsibility is the professions. I do not need to review for this knowledgeable audience the intimate relationship between the professional school and the profession itself. (I distinguish between "intimate" and "cordial." The relationship is always intimate, sometimes cordial.) The school guards the door of the profession. What kinds of individuals train for the profession, what kinds of preparation they receive, whether they cherish high standards of performance—all of these and more are determined largely by the professional school. It is not surprising that in field after field the practicing professionals have sought to control the schools. Their interests is legitimate, but of course the schools must not be controlled from outside. They must be an integral part of the university, lending and gaining strength for the rest of the university community, collaborating in the same great intellectual enterprise, committed to the same values.

But their capacity to maintain their own integrity depends upon making their values and goals recognized among the leadership of the profession. Therefore they must move out and take an interest in the profession itself. I am convinced that to an increasing degree the professional school must play a statesmanlike role in the profession at large.

Now let me turn to international affairs. To say that the universities have ventured off campus in response to the challenge of international affairs is a gross understatement. They have traveled to the ends of the earth. But as in so many of their extramural dealings—their response has been characterized by energy rather than direction, and not always informed by a clear conception of the appropriate role for the university in the international field.

The hazards of this kind of response are well illustrated in the early history of the university overseas contracts. When the International Cooperation Administration began to write contracts with the universities for overseas service, it conceived the relationship as basically a purchase of services, and unfortunately many universities acquiesced. A good many of the universities did not ask whether the activities in question were ones to which they could make a unique contribution, whether they were a wise expenditure of effort in terms of the total mission of the university, whether they would leave any increment of growth for the institution itself.

One may criticize the ICA for using the universities in this fashion. But as long as the universities have no conception of themselves other than the supermarket conception, they will have to resign themselves to the fact that people will walk in off the street, buy a box of Wheaties, and walk out.

Even today the universities are engaged in activities overseas which ill accord with the highest conception of the university's role. The universities have a long and honorable tradition of international activities. This tradition draws its strength from the universal character of the values which animate teachers and scholars. The international fellowship of learning is as old as civilization. The international tradition of the universities may manifest itself in new ways—as in a concern for economic development—but it must not be distorted in the service of values which are not its own. It is not appropriate, for example, for a university to engage in propaganda. It is not proper for a university to engage in political maneuvering.

Functioning within their own tradition, the universities enjoy an enviable dignity and prestige, and a reputation for disinterested and high-minded action. The demands of the moment should never entice them into activities which compromise that reputation. During World War II, England's Admiral Cunningham had to decide whether to go on with the evacuation of the British Army from Crete even at the risk of losing ships. He said, "It takes the navy 3 years to build a ship. It will take 300 years to build a new tradition. The evacuation will continue."

I have given three examples of extramural activities in which the university has a continuing responsibility. Other examples will occur to you. Now let me turn back to a more general consideration of the university's role in our society. Any coherent conception of the university's role must begin with an understanding of the university's central missions—teaching and intellectual inquiry. These are the secret of the university's strength, and the springs of its vitality. To the extent that it allows itself to be diverted from these functions, it is contributing to its own eventual decay as a significant institution.

The extramural activities of the university need not impair the university's capacity to carry out its central mission. They may even increase it. But this outcome will be assured only if the university plans it that way.

No outsider can presume to say how far the universities should go in meeting the demands on their time. Only university people can weigh the competing pressures they face. And only university people can appraise the very real limits of money and personnel they struggle with. A Nigerian proverb says, "The owner of the house knows where the roof leaks."

To sum up, then, in the years ahead the Nation is going to demand many kinds of help from the universities, many kinds of leadership. And we know that the universities are going to respond in some fashion. They may respond haphazardly, scattering their energies, accepting trivial assignments, playing technician when they should be playing statesman. Or they may respond wisely, setting their own priorities, recognizing the primacy of their intramural commitments, and giving adequate recognition to those fields in which they must exercise real leadership.

I should like to see the universities debate their role in society as fully and vigorously as they have debated the other great issues of academic life. Whatever the outcome of that debate, I should like to believe that everything the university undertakes in the world of affairs—whether it is the consulting work of a single professor or a major university project—would bear the indelible stamp of the university's style—in the kinds of objectives sought, and in the manner of approaching these objectives. Everything that the university does in the world outside should be marked by its commitment to the highest standards of performance, its habit of taking the long perspective, its preoccupation with root problems, its intellectual approach to practical matters, its disciplined habit of mind, its commitment to the highest values of our culture and its relative disengagement from the self-interested considerations which move protagonists in the day-to-day strife of the world.

In other words, in everything that the universities undertake they should be true to themselves. Only in that way can they exercise their great intellectual and moral influence to accomplish objectives within their own tradition. (Address, 42d Annual Meeting, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., October 8, 1959.)

The University in World Affairs: An Introduction

*by William W. Marvel**

Mr. Marvel, president of Education and World Affairs, contributed the introductory chapter to "The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities," a book-length report published by that organization in 1966.

No one has yet fully tabulated the many roles universities play in 20th century society—and it is unlikely that anyone ever will. There are too many; the roster grows too rapidly; and, perhaps above all, variations from one country to another greatly complicate the task. But even a full catalog would reveal little we do not already know; it would simply support our recognition of the university as one of the most adaptable and evolutionary institutions of man's invention. There is pure fascination in the thought that a modern complexity such as Berkeley can trace its lineage back almost a thousand years to the medieval establishments at Bologna and Salamanca. And there is even greater fascination in contemplating the growth which this extended family system will experience, in every corner of the world, in the remaining years of this century.

Small wonder, therefore, that the university is the object of such worldwide attention, curiousity, and affection. It has become a first necessity of every newly independent country, frequently ranking ahead of a national airline as a prestige symbol. In many parts of Latin America, the perception of the university is changing: the old complacency with an assemblage of faculties of medicine, pharmacy, and law—the ancient mechanisms whereby society's elites perpetuated themselves—is giving way to the search for modernity, quality, and inclusiveness. Rebounding from the scourges of nazism, fascism and war, the univerties of Western Europe have shown remarkable recuperative power. No longer content with the ivory tower, high abstration, and all that the classical tradition implied, they are increasingly concerned with empiricism, the social sciences, and a linking up with contemporary problems.

Who can doubt that in the Soviet Union the universities have been major change agents in the maturation of that country as a great power, or in the "mellowing" of its role in world politics? Indeed, the first moves in the post-Stalin era to open up more normal intercourse with the West were in the field of educational and scientific exchanges, and therefore focused on the universities. The United Kingdom in the last few years has been going through an experience that in its case is unique: an intensive reexamination of the relevance and adequacy of its higher educational system. That country is now adding new universities and modifying its traditional approach in ways that would have been unimaginable a decade ago. The list could

---

*© 1966, Education and World Affairs, New York.

be expanded: in Japan, Australia, Egypt, India, and certainly not least Communist China (about which we in the United States know so little) universities have come to bulk large in the calculations of national leadership.

Thus, the concerted attention we in the United States have given our colleges and universities in the last 15 or 20 years is not a peculiarly American phenomenon. The growth and change of our higher educational system, the extent to which our universities have become the object of inquiry, review, and commentary, and the democratization of access to higher education—in all these things the differences that mark American developments are those of degree. We are part of a great worldwide effort of reshaping the university and strengthening its bonds with society—a movement largely stimulated by developments in the United States.

One tendency to be seen in this simultaneous, universal concern with education and especially with institutions of higher learning is the evolution of universities toward more common patterns. They are becoming increasingly similar, one to another, around the world. The point should not be exaggerated: there is little danger that universities are moving so fast in this direction that soon we shall have carbon-copy institutions around the earth. National, historical, and cultural traditions, fortunately, will never cease to exert their shaping influence, to impart a certain personality and idiosyncrasy to the institutions of a particular country or region. We can be thankful for the strength of those traditions, for who would welcome a world of homogenized universities, lacking the color and flavor that diversity and variation assure?

But the trend is present. In many Latin American countries, for example, major efforts are being made to staff higher education with full-time teaching scholars, tending to bring those universities into line with the prevailing pattern in the United States and Western Europe. The increasingly prominent role of our own Federal Government in financing higher education makes our system more nearly comparable to the relationship of government to higher education found in other parts of the world.

Then there is the closing of the gap between science and nonscience within higher education. This is far from being a massive trend, but on the other hand there can scarcely be a university leader who is not concerned about making scientists more humanistic, and assuring that humanists, social scientists, and others are conversant with the purposes and methods of science. So the scientific and technological institutions will become more like general universities, while attention to science and engineering will be an increasingly strong requirement for any general university that aspires to first rank.

Even in the service role of the university, which is so distinctive a part of the American pattern, we observe a gradual involvement of European institutions of higher learning. There is no headlong rush, but there is a trend toward adding service to the traditional European university purposes of research and teaching.

It is probably inevitable that the world's universities should be moving down different but converging roads in matters of purpose, orientation, structure, and staffing. They are, after all, being acted on by roughly the same constellation of forces: mounting costs of education, hence the need for huge financial investment; spiraling demands for university services, imposed by national societies in all stages of development; recognition of high-talent manpower (the "product" of universities) as a country's most precious and critical resource; the race to keep up with the advancing frontiers of scientific knowledge; and the sharp upward trend in the numbers of those seeking admission to universities, as the commitment to equality of educational opportunity becomes a nearly universal phenomenon. When an African vice chancellor, a Latin American rector, and a U.S. university president meet, it is obvious why they so quickly find themselves on the same wave length!

One meaning of this growing alikeness of universities, rooted as they are in distinct cultural traditions and separated by thousands of miles of ocean and desert, is the strengthening of the *international intellectual community.* Essentially, that community exists among men of learning, who seek after new knowledge, who are at home in the realm of ideas—and who feel the responsibility to transmit their learning, knowledge, and ideas to their own contemporaries and to the generations that follow. It is to be found among men who are drawn together by bonds of common interest and pursuit, who communicate across national boundaries and language barriers.

In theory, such a community might exist without universities, but the possibility is remote. The university is in fact the institutional form of this intellectual community. It is in the university itself, and in the things that university people do, that one senses and feels the existence of this community. Therefore, the more agreement that exists among universities around the world on fundamental matters of purpose, role, structure, and functioning, the more readily can scholars move about in the world of universities and the more easily are their ideas disseminated. Thus is the international intellectual community translated from concept to reality.

In the widest sense, it is with the membership of American colleges and universities in the intellectual community of the world that the present volume is concerned. In putting it this way, we include virtually every institution of higher learning in the United States, for surely this is not a case where some are members and others are not. Participation is a matter of degree; simply to be a college or university makes some extent of membership almost unavoidable. Even the most modest institution will have courses in European history, world literature, and a few foreign languages. To move from there to the massive involvement in the outer world found at the universities examined in the following pages is to travel far. But there is no predetermined point on the journey where the threshold is crossed and the candidate suddenly becomes eligible for membership in the world intellectual community. That membership, one might say, is inherent in the fact of being an institution of higher learning.

If this great intellectual community has therefore been present to some degree for as long as we have had universities in the world, it follows that most of the things now being done by U.S. institutions in the area of international affairs are not basically new activities. There are new forms, more sophisticated rationales, more elaborate machinery, and an enormous increase in the scale of activity, but the fundamental processes are the same. It all still has to do with learning and teaching and exchanging ideas across national boundaries. It is essential to keep this in mind when considering the proud chapter in the history of higher education now being written by American universities as they assume growing responsibilities in world affairs. To forget this thread of continuity with the past is to see present efforts as a vast disruptive and diversionary influence. To remember it is to recognize in what we are now doing the very essence of the university tradition.

In our approach to the international involvement of universities, we crossed an important watershed in the United States about 1960. Behind us were two decades of growing activity by American higher education on the world affairs front. Early in 1940's our universities were drawn into support of the national war effort, mounting a vast array of training programs to produce the kind of quickly trained manpower demanded by the worst conflagration the world had ever seen. But the beginnings of what a decade later would become a massive development in American higher education occurred during the peacetime years of the late 1940's. We had learned a bitter lesson during the war concerning our national ignorance of peoples, cultures, and languages outside the Western European tradition. Taking that lesson to heart, leaders in some of the universities and the foundations collaborated on the first area study programs, which focused on the Soviet Union and Asia.

Before 1950, therefore, the seeds of many of the important developments of the next 15 years had been sown in the terrain of American academia. The fifties were a period of sprouting and growth on many different sectors of the front. This was the decade of the Fulbright program and the start of university contracts for institution-building abroad on the part of the foreign aid agency (first the Foreign Operations Administration and then the International Cooperation Administration). Area and language centers expanded in number and grew in strength on the campuses of the Nation. Concerted research efforts in many aspects of international affairs were undertaken at the larger universities. The comparative study of political systems underwent refurbishing and reinvigoration, largely through the impetus of the group of dedicated scholars who made up the Comparative Politics Committee of the Social Science Research Council.

This was also the decade of the foreign student, as men and women came to the colleges and universities of America in ever-growing numbers, and as our own young people at both the graduate and undergraduate levels went abroad to pursue their studies as "foreigners" in the universities of other lands. During the latter half of that decade the Iron Curtain was first breached by a new program of academic and scholarly exchanges with the Soviet Union.

It was a period of experimentation and innovation in many distinct parts of the world affairs front of higher education. Programs were launched in several key universities for the development of materials and the training of teachers looking toward the growth of international and non-Western studies among undergraduates, as a part of liberal arts education. Attempts to correct America's weaknesses in foreign languages, especially in the little-studied or "exotic" languages, got well underway in the fifties. The Council on Higher Education in the American Republics (CHEAR) was founded as a new arrangement for regular exchanges on common problems of higher education among North American and Latin American university leaders. The ferment and new approaches of the 1950's were a fitting prelude to the even more significant changes that were to occur in the early 1960's.

The fact that the United States entered a new period of development about 1960 is revealed by several new trends that set in as the decade opened. For the first time *the whole university* came into focus as the major actor on the stage of international education. Up until then, although nearly everything that went on in that field was obviously related to the universities and colleges, we were not yet at the point of considering these diverse activities within the context of the university as a total, integral institution. One reason for tying this new conception to the year 1960 is the publication by the Ford Foundation in the last month of that year of the report of the Committee on the University and World Affairs, usually referred to as the Morrill committee report. On the committee were assembled a distinguished group of men from universities, foundations, business, and government. Their report was a systematic attempt to clarify the international role of American universities and to suggest ways that our institutions of higher learning might perform more effectively in the realm of world affairs. The Morrill committee report has other significances, but the point here is that it took *the university as its focal point*, relating to it such constituent parts of the full picture as foreign students, language studies, education for technical assistance, and world affairs in liberal education.

The 1960's were to see two kinds of developments closely related to this focus on the whole university. First, there emerged a new concern as to how universities should approach the problem of integrating and relating in a meaningful fashion their far-ranging international interests. On one campus after another, faculty and administration began to question how the institution should organize itself internally in order to carry its growing responsibilities on the international front and to derive from those activities the maximum possible educational benefit. Secondly, a strong trend developed toward new arrangements for interinstitutional cooperation, the working out of various patterns among colleges and universities that would permit greater division of labor, economy of effort, and maximization of results. Major moves were made by some of the largest universities, for example, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan State in the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities; and nine major Amercan institutions in a consortium to assist the development of a new technological university in Kanpur, India. At the same time, some of the smaller colleges were coming together into new associations so as to achieve through common action a level of participation in world affairs that would be far beyond the reach of a single small institution acting on its own. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest, the Great Lakes Colleges Association and the Regional Council for International Education based on the University of Pittsburgh—all were formed at least partly with an eye to the possibilities of educational enrichment that would stem from an active role on the international front.

The other reason for thinking of 1960 as a watershed was the shifts that occurred in the pattern of financial support for college and university programs in world affairs. The U.S. Government came prominently into the picture under title VI of the National Defense Education Act, which, although adopted earlier, did not become a major influence in the academic world until the early 1960's. So the responsibilities that had been largely borne by the private foundations during the forties and fifties were to be shared, on an increasing scale, by the Federal Government. And at about the same time, the Ford Foundation, the major private source of support for university activities in the international area, adopted a new approach. Ford began a series of grants that provided to selected institutions large-scale, long-term, all-universitywide support for their international programs. Based on careful planning and the development of an integrated approach by the institution itself, these new grants further emphasized the total university as the framework for the participation of American higher education in world affairs.

Finally, 1960 represents a time of transition because our basic interpretation of foreign aid, and especially our understanding of the role of educational assistance within it, took on a new sophistication with the passage of the International Development and Security Act of 1961. Contracting with universities for the conduct of programs abroad began, of course, during the 1950's. But it was only after the opening of the new decade that the role of education and manpower planning in national development came to be generally appreciated within the foreign aid agency, then renamed the Agency for International Development (AID). Although this new understanding was not translated into action as rapidly as many observers wished, it gradually brought significant changes—in the formulation of programs, in the evaluation of accomplishments, in the relationship of research to other aspects of foreign assistance, and in the felt need within AID for a closer partnership with the university community.

We are now 5 years past the watershed of 1960. The major, almost glacial resistances to constructive university involvments in world affairs have receded. These last 5 years have been a time of inquiry and searching for new answers, of continuing efforts to make our national performance more effective. One needs no crystal ball to foresee that further progress and further refinements in our approach lie ahead in the second half of this decade. (*The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities.*)

The College and University in International Affairs

by the Trustees of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

A summary of a discussion, reported in the Foundation's Annual Report for 1959–1960:

Not even within the academic world is there full agreement as to the scope of the university's responsibilities in international matters. This lack of clarity is still more noticeable outside the academic world.

For example, when a Washington official discusses education on international affairs with a professor, he is almost certain, sooner or later, to say: "All these high-flown programs are fine, but what are you doing to educate the great American public?"

The answer is "Very little, directly," and properly so. Although colleges and universities reach substantial numbers of adults through their extension programs, they are not well equipped to conduct really broad programs of public education.

But they have an immensely important *indirect* role in educating the public. It is the task of the university to *teach the people who will educate the public.* The public is "taught" by editors, radio and TV commentators, magazine writers, writers of popular books, public school teachers, lecturers, clergymen, public officials, and community leaders. Almost all of these are college educated. If the college has done its work well, they will do a good job of educating the public.

The colleges and universities have a second job to do: they must produce the research and the resource material on which *all* education on international matters—academic or popular—must be based. The individual engaged in popular education, whether he is a magazine writer or a lecturer, probably has read the major university-produced books on the subject.

In short, the role of the university is very important—but it is one step removed from the broad public audience. And the university cannot strengthen its contribution by trying to make that role more direct. It must stick to its last.

Among the most controversial of the universities' activities in the international field have been the numerous oversea services they have performed under contract to our Government—helping underdeveloped areas to plan their economic growth, strengthening foreign universities, assisting new nations to develop modern administrative procedures, and so on.

Are the universities doing these things because it is an authentic part of their responsibility to do them? Or are they doing them just to be cooperative? Or because they can't resist a share in current excitements? Is it the business of an American university to help an

Asian nation reform its police administration? Should the universities assist our Government in its program of economic and technical aid to underdeveloped countries?

There is no unanimity in the academic world on these questions.

One may explore the responsibility of the universities at several levels. One may ask, "How wide is the responsibility of a university?" Are the responsibilities of a State university limited by the boundaries of the State? Is the responsibility of a private university to be defined in terms of its visible constituencies—students, alumni, board members, parents, the surrounding community?

The answer to both questions is "No." Our private and public universities have long since established the principle that their responsibilities cannot be defined in terms of their immediate constituencies. Many of our private institutions are conducting programs which are explicable *only* in terms of their value to the nation or to mankind. Similarly our leading public institutions have long since moved beyond the set of responsibilities defined by their tax base. Virtually all our great State institutions are performing services which can be explained only as services to the Nation as a whole.

The principle is a fundamental one. Once a university is set into operation, its responsibilities are defined by academic tradition, by the nature of the intellectual enterprise, and by the broadest conception of the needs of society at large and mankind generally.

There are critics, however, who would say, "We agree that the university's responsibility is not defined by its local constituency, but its responsibility is not limitless. Specifically, it is not the university's job to help the Government get its business done."

The soundness of this assertion is highly debatable. In our system, the Government has never had a monopoly on public purpose. A nongovernmental institution has a right—in some cases a responsibility—to contribute to public purposes. The fate of free institutions and free societies in the world at large is a matter of grave and immediate interest to the universities. Our system permits them to act in support of that interest. It would be a tragic mistake to suppose that only the Federal Government could contribute to such national goals, that only public institutions could concern themselves with such public purposes.

As a matter of fact, the universities have already given a very effective demonstration of how our system can work to the good of the Nation. After World War II nothing could have been more genuinely a matter for national concern than training people in the field of international affairs. The Federal Government should have been actively interested—but this was an issue on which it was sound asleep. The universities—public and private—were not asleep. The Government has finally awakened and is actively interested in the subject, but 99 percent of the accomplishments and achievements in this field today stem from activity initiated years ago outside the Federal Government.

Among those who resist heavy involvement of the university in overseas contracts, many believe that the university simply has not the resources to perform every chore that requires expert knowledge. Their concern is not that the university will go beyond some theoretical definition of its function, but that it will destroy its usefulness by trying to do too many things on too many fronts.

But others argue that if the universities do not undertake the overseas assignments, the Government will simply have to create new institutions to perform these functions. This is not an attractive possibility.

The argument has still other facets. Some heartily agree that the universities cannot hold themselves aloof from the great issues of the day, but believe that the universities' involvement should be wholly at the level of teaching and research. In contrast, there is the view strongly held by the land-grant institutions that the university is a service agency committed to contribute to society not only through teaching and research but through the performance of many practical tasks which involve a high level of expertness. The land-grant institutions have a long and honorable tradition of such service at the State level, and they see no difficulty in extending the principle to the national and international spheres.

The proponents of these opposing views are not in bitter conflict, but they have a genuine difference of opinion. And the difference may never be resolved. At bottom, it stems from differing views of the university as a social institution. There is no reason why we should demand a showdown between these views. If Yale chooses to make its contribution to international affairs in one way, and Purdue in quite another way, nothing but good can come of allowing each to act in terms of its own tradition.

RELATION OF THE UNIVERSITIES TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A good many university leaders believe that in performing overseas tasks for the Government, the university too often accepts a role it would not think of accepting at home. At home the university is very sensitive to outside control, even more sensitive to any pressure to "sell" a particular point of view. Yet overseas it often gets itself into the position of meekly doing what it is told, and of selling whatever point of view our Government favors at the moment. Few academic leaders can accept this as a sound role for the university.

The university can be effective only when it is being true to itself. Operating within this relatively limited role, the university can be extremely useful overseas. Foreign universities and governments value the freedom, integrity and objectivity of the American university, and its lack of subservience to official policy. These are assets we should not throw away.

The Government can make effective use of the universities if it understands these things.

Some American university presidents, disturbed by the large commitments the university seems to be accepting all over the world, have proposed that the Federal Government deal directly with faculty members as individuals, retaining their services where necessary without involving the university as an institution. This is often done, and will continue to be common practice. But it will never advance to the point where the universities are free of major responsibilities. Foreign governments often prefer to deal with universities rather than with the U.S. Government or with individuals. Furthermore, American academic people working overseas usually refer to operate as representatives of their university rather than as individuals or as Government employees.

Academic leaders should give attention to the effect of overseas contracts on the university itself, and should devise ways of working which will strengthen rather than weaken the university when they undertake such activities. The university is not just a reservoir of high talent manpower to be drawn on by government. It has important business of its own. Overseas programs can strengthen the capacity of the university to accomplish its own purposes—but only under wise management. The university should expect that any overseas operation should leave some residue in improvement of the curriculum, in better informed students, in more stimulating professors, in some new campus program, or in any of a number of other ways.

Some academic leaders argue that every overseas contract of the Federal Government should contain a certain amount of money which the university may use to strengthen itself as an institution for dealing with problems of this nature. The university could well use such funds, for example, in a long-term plan to solve the grave shortage of highly trained personnel for overseas service.

Some of the difficulty in Government-university relationships on overseas contracts has stemmed with the absence of adequate university representation in Washington. This is not said in criticism of the various higher educational associations that have been active in Washington. They have done their job well. But the need has outstripped the present arrangements for university representation.

The Government's requirements for assistance from the universities will continue. Large sums—larger than in the past—will be appropriated. In the absence of effective representation from the universities, people who do not know the university world will write the legislation governing the distribution of these funds. Without such representation, the interests, needs and capacities of the universities will not be reflected in the programs, and the programs will be managed by people who have no real conception of how they can most effectively work with the universities to serve the national need. Both in their own interest and in the national interest, the universities must learn to help shape the forces which impinge on them so strongly. (Fifty-fifth Annual Report, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.)

Peace, Understanding, and Education

by Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.

In an address to the 1965 convention of the National Catholic Educational Association Mr. Babbidge, president of the University of Connecticut, dealt with the international dimensions of education within the theme of the convention—"Education for Peace and Understanding."

It is remarkable, really, how recently we have come to be conscious of and appreciate the role of education in promoting world understanding and in achieving peace. Education, properly defined, has, of course, always served these ends, and yet we have not thought about it in this light. When the UNESCO charter observed that "Wars begin in the minds of man," it came as something of a revelatory shock to many. Only in this post-World War II period have we heard education referred to as an "arm of foreign policy," and only in this period have we seen major, structured efforts to break down barriers of international communication.

But the tempo of efforts in these two decades has been impressive. Let us take the field of international exchange of persons for illustrative purposes. Governmental effort is only the most visible part of this iceberg, but its dimensions are impressive enough. The Department of State has made it possible for some 22,000 short-term visitors to come to the United States, and AID will this year welcome its 100,000th program participant. Under the so-called Fulbright program, some 60,000 Americans have gone abroad as scholars and lecturers, teachers, or students. And a dynamic Peace Corps may yet outdo all these programs. The United States has become a kind of mecca for foreign students, with one quarter of all students outside their own countries now located at universities and colleges in this country.

As I say, these are just the efforts of our Federal Government, and they are a small part of the total national investment in international exchange. Hard figures are not available in other areas, but one has to call attention to few nongovernmental programs, from the historic Rhodes scholarships to the ambituous program of the American Field Service and the admired junior year abroad programs, to suggest the enormity of the total effort. My own alma mater and sister institution, Yale, long famed for its Yale-in-China program, has recently announced yet another program of student study and travel, dubbed by students characteristically, as the "junior year in the jungle" program.

These impressive developments in the international exchange of persons have their parallels in other general areas of international education. A tremendous effort, for example, has gone into the creation of educational institutions in the so-called developing nations. Such work has been going on for many decades under the auspices of your Church and others, but in the last 20 years massive injections of governmental support have accelerated this development. The international flow of information and ideas has also increased greatly in both volume and force. Even conscious "curtains" of restraint have been punctured by a combination of advances in communications techniques and a heightened realization that knowledge cannot be long bottled up, except at the peril of the bottler.

Progress in international education has been impressive. But a glass that is half full is also half empty. And we have reason to believe that much remains to be done. Two recent reports have made this apparent. "The University and World Affairs" published in 1960, and a sequel, "The College and World Affairs," (1964) call attention to some rather dramatic deficiencies in our national effort at the higher education level. I commend these reports to your attention, though I think I need only quote briefly from "The College and World Affairs" to suggest their tone:

> For the first time, the United States [in 1945] began to acknowledge the intrinsic importance of cultures beyond the Western periphery and to speak, at first softly, of the "provincialism" of its undergraduate education.
>
> Realizing that a wide public understanding of foreign cultures was now essential, educational critics turned to the schools, colleges, and universities and found them wanting. The undergraduate curriculum of higher education had not kept pace with the new dimensions of world involvement. Liberal learning, conceived in the civilization of the West, remained parochial. As the new need became apparent, a few undergraduate programs were modified. They drew stimulation from events and from the graduate programs of the universities. Too few institutions, however, in the 19 years since the war ended, have taken vigorous action to educate our youth to meet the requirements of a changing world. We have perceived the need for a new strategy of liberal learning but, as a nation, we have realized it only in small measure. Today the need has acquired a note of urgency.[1]

There are sins of omission in our international educational efforts, and we must consider, at least, whether or not these are also sins of commission. It would be unrealistic to assume that what we're doing, we're doing to perfection. Certainly there are areas of doubt, disagreement and concern, and I should like to suggest a few of these, illustratively.

Take, for example, the delicate problems that arise from our effort to aid the developing nations. That our desire to help them is great and genuine, I think no fair person could deny. The real question is, "what is the best way to help them?"

The United States was, as Henry Steele Commager has observed, "the first of the new nations." And I think it is illuminating to go back in history to see how we felt about such matters. A Mr. Bannister once asked Thomas Jefferson what he thought about sending an American youth abroad to Europe for his education. Mr. Jefferson responded with spirit, and in the negative:

> He acquires a fondness for European luxury and dissipation, and a contempt for the simplicity of his own country; he is fascinated with the privileges of the European aristocrats, and sees, with abhorrence, the lovely equality which the poor enjoy with the rich, in his own country; he contracts a partiality for aristocracy or monarchy; he forms foreign friendships which will never be useful to him, and loses the seasons of life for forming, in his own country, those friendships which, of all others, are the most faithful and permanent; he retains, through life, a fond recollection, and a hankering after those places,

---

[1] "The College and World Affairs," p. 6.

> which were the scenes of his first pleasures and of his first connections; he returns to his own country, a foreigner, unacquainted with the practices of domestic economy, necessary to preserve him from ruin, speaking and writing his native tongue as a foreigner * * *. It appears to me, then, that an American, coming to Europe for education, loses in his knowledge, in his morals, in his health, in his habits, and in his happiness."[2]

If it is not totally unfair to assume that such an attitude may well characterize a new nation, even today, is it not proper to assume that our long-range goal should be the goal that early American leaders had: the development of indigenous domestic resources to meet the needs of a new nation?

But what of the urgent, shortrun needs of these new nations?

African nations are desperately in need of trained manpower who can lead them to the kind of economic development upon which their long-term future depends. The quickest way to get them trained is to bring them here, where educational resources already exist. This we do, and with enthusiasm. But once we have them here, we begin to encounter a lot of difficult questions. Shall they study what they wish—which is the privilege we extend to our own youth—or shall they study what is needed most back home? And, indeed, shall they go back home? We brought them here initially to help meet a national need of Africa; but once they get here, we begin to think of them as individuals, and we wonder why they should have to go back to Africa if they don't care to?

Indenture is abhorrent to us, by and large, and we don't relish the though of forcing someone to fulfill an implied commitment the full ramifications of which he may not have understood at the time he made it. Must he go back to eating "mealie" after 4 years of American diet? What if the government has changed from a friendly one to a hostile one in his absence? What if he has married an American while here? What if he has become an engineer fully qualified to earn a professional salary in the United States, in contrast to a highly limited opportunity in his homeland? What if he is "needed" in the United States—as for example, as a teacher of African culture and affairs in an American educational institution?

Confronted with these very valid questions, we waver in our initial resolve to train a man for Africa; and we are inclined to think that what we really want to do is educate a man—a freeman—who may choose his own course of action. And if we give into this instinct, what ensues? Our own Government, having supported a student exchange with the object in mind of helping an African nation, threatens to withdraw its support of such programs. The leaders of the African nation, outraged that they have lost rather than gained from an intended gesture of help, refuse to participate further in such exchanges.

Can we, in the light of these consequences, afford to regard students from new nations as we regard our own, and treat them as freemen and free spirits? Or to put the question in reverse, can we afford to negate the values of free individual choice in the name of strategic efforts to build nations?

A wise journalist once observed to me that any man could adhere to and administer a principle, but that it took a statesman to reconcile principles in conflict with one another. And this, it seems to me, is precisely what confronts us here. We do not need doctrinaire answers, we need a genuinely statesmanlike resolution of an exceedingly complex issue.

---

[2] "Objections to Sending American Students to Europe." Letter, from Paris, to J. Bannister, in Padover, "The *Complete Jefferson*," pp. 1055–1057.

And if we have problems in our educational relationships with emerging nations, we have them also in our relations with mature nations. We are, it is alleged, in danger of neglecting old friends. Can we afford to think of educational exchange as a one-way street, in which we help those less fortunate than ourselves? Can we not acknowledge that we ourselves may benefit from a little foreign educational aid?

There is reason to think we do acknowledge the importance of our relationship with cultures older than ours. Indeed, our enthusiasm for importing the talent of mature academic societies has created its own strains, in the form of an oft-cited "Brain Drain" in European nations. But we do have to face the hard questions of priority in the assignment of effort, for example, in federally financed programs, and the inevitable question arises as to whether or not the allocation of greater resources to new and strategically important nations constitutes neglect of old and strategically important nations. If international understanding is important, can we tolerate the lack of understanding that persists of our closest neighbor and ally, Canada? Or is it as true in international education as elsewhere, that the "squeaky wheel gets the grease?"

I suppose that the kind of problems that emerge from our growing international educational efforts can be viewed as a byproduct of success, and that we ought not to be preoccupied with them.

And yet I wonder, if we might not be able to mitigate many of them and solve others by recognizing that a possible basic weakness in our international educational efforts may exist. Permit me * * * to discuss this possibility under the heading,

The Goal Too Consciously Sought

And as this heading suggests, I am intrigued by the possibility that we may be approaching this work in a manner that is too self-conscious on the one hand, and on the other hand too narrowly concerned with demonstrable results, and hence with utilitarian programs.

I think I encounter clues that suggest this possibility, in a variety of places. They are most obvious, of course, in the case of Government-sponsored programs, where education is consciously employed as a strategic device. It is not surprising, therefore, that the success of these programs is likely to be measured in terms of fairly immediate impact upon economic and political relationships. This is not to excuse our Government (for I happen to believe its programs might be greatly strengthened by subduing this persistent sense of immediacy) but simply to say that pragmatism is more logically to be expected here.

But quite outside the pattern of Government programs, I think I see evidences of what is impatience at best, and lack of conviction at worst.

Take the public concern about American tourists abroad. We seem to be afraid that they're going to make a bad "impression." I think myself that they're probably a fairly representative group of Americans, including their disposition to be a little silly in strange situations, and that in criticizing them we're blaming the mirror for what we see in it. But more importantly, can we reasonably be preoccupied with our "image" abroad, when our avowed concern is with true understanding? Is it not essential that our weaknesses as a culture be as fully revealed as our strengths?

The American academic community, too, seems to want to want to put forward only its best foot. There has been some criticism of an alleged "declining quality" of American lecturers going aboard. The implication is that our standing in the world academic community is jeopardized because we betray the fact that not all American professors are distinguished. Can we afford to be that preoccupied with image if, as I believe, honesty is an essential ingredient in true understanding? I think we have to come to grips with the issue of whether or not our goal is true international understanding—weaknesses and all—or a kind of cultural one-upmanship. There is, I am sure, a conflict here between our expressed desire to promote understanding, and our understandable but nonetheless regrettable preoccupation with good-impressionism.

Another suggestion of a too-conscious pursuit of these goals is to be found in the American academic community, and in the way it organizes itself. The growing emphasis on foreign languages not as liberal arts, but as utilitarian tools; the structuring of area study programs with a conscious pattern of occupational preparation; the proliferation of overseas "centers"; and international "divisions" that attract "contracts" to "build institutions" abroad. Are these not clues that we may be running too hard after something? Is true international understanding—the foundation of peace—something we can achieve by simply grabbing for it? Does it derive from immersion in the practical, applied problems of foreign cultures? That such exposures are helpful ingredients of understanding, I think no one will deny. But is there not a danger that we may become preoccupied with these direct involvements and fail to appreciate that certain, far more elusive elements go into the structure of world understanding and peace?

I do not seriously expect us to become unconcerned about our image abroad. And I pray that we will never overlook the mundane, utilitarian factors essential to economic and political stability in this world. But we are educators, and we have a responsibility to insure that in using education for these ends, we do not permit its abuse. And we have a responsibility to consider whether, in our search for peace and world understanding, education serves best as a self-conscious device for the achievement of immediate political goals; or whether it has a higher function to perform.

Is it necessary for a responsible educational institution, dedicated to the goals of world understanding and peace, to immerse itself in these exciting programs of direct international involvement? To offer instruction in Chinese, to have an AID contract, to send its faculty and students abroad? I find a partial answer in a quotation from William Faulkner:

"Experience," Uncle Gavin said:

> "is not in the senses, but in the heart. I cite you the world travelers, the tense and furious circumnavigators: first 3 years, then 1 year, then 3 months and then 1 month and then 90 hours and now—or am I wrong?—30 hours, and

> who knows but what perhaps at this very instant somebody with still more money, for whom somebody has invented a still faster machine, has just departed to do it in 3 hours, leaving behind him, embalmed in cosmos-flung television to beat among the very stars themselves, his immortal epitaph: "Goodbye, Ma, and may the best man win." I cite you blind Homer, unable to quit the Athenian stone he sat on without a child to lead him, yet plumbed and charted the ultimate frontiers of passion and defeat and glory and ambition and courage and hope and fear.[3]

Now, I have said some things here * * * that could easily be misinterpreted. Forgive me, therefore, if I take a minute to make sure I'm not egregiously misunderstood. I am myself heavily involved in active programs in which education serves to meet immediate and pressing needs in the international field. I am, if you will, a "furious circumnavigator" of the globe. I wouldn't do this if I did not believe it had substantial value; and I would not do it if I did not think it was a legitimate educational function.

But I am persuaded that one of education's greatest contributions to the long-term goals expressed in the theme of this convention, is a longer, slower, less-dramatic process by means of which men come to know better, not others, but themselves.

For I believe that they also serve the cause of understanding and peace, who only stand for those humane educational values that have been proven over centuries. Carl Becker has said of the study of history: "It's value—is, indeed, not scientific, but moral: by liberalizing the mind, by deepening the sympathies, by fortifying the will, it enables us to control, not society, but ourselves—a much more important thing; it prepares us to live more humanely in the present and to meet rather than foretell the future."

Can we not in fairness claim that *all* we do as educators to encourage honest self-understanding, moves us closer to the goals of peace and international understanding? I think so.

From the other side of one of those curtains constructed to frustrate the goal of international understanding, Boris Pasternak once offered a clue to the basic educational foundations of peace, when he wrote:

> * * * what has for centuries raised mankind above the beast is—not the cudgel but an inward music: the irresistible power of unarmed truth, the powerful attraction of its example.[4]

Let us resolve, then, in our efforts as educators, to promote understanding and peace, that there is much that needs doing that is not now being done: that we must work separately and jointly and through the one government we have in common to prepare young people to live in the close and crowded world of the 21st century. But let us resolve also, that we will not in so doing neglect those functions of education that have, since the beginning of recorded history, served to raise mankind above the beast. (Address, 62d Annual Convention, National Catholic Educational Association, New York, Apr. 20, 1965.)

---

[3] "A Name for the City," Harper's magazine, October 1950.

[4] Dr. Zhivago, p. 42.

The Role of the University in Developing World Community

by Paul A. Miller

Formerly President of West Virginia University. Mr. Miller was appointed Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in July 1966.

The genius of the modern American university is that it proposes to join the classic aim of preparing free men through open inquiry with that of putting knowledge to use. Citizens have come from every social class to enter its portals while out from the same portals have gone streams of faculty to influence the far corners of every type of community. Multiple commitments have resulted from this involvement to State, local, and Federal governments, to centers of political power, and to national and international purposes. Influenced by the public university tradition, the entire establishment of higher education in the United States has moved inexorably to widespread public confrontation, first with the domestic life of the United States and presently to a larger concern with international community.

The radical ideas which the American university sponsored for more than a century have become influential in the world community. Among these are the beliefs that all human effort is dignified and amenable to education and that the talent for civic wisdom is as widespread among the common people as within the elite. By these same beliefs the university contributed significantly to the development of American life. Allan Nevins, in his sprightly essay on "The State Universities and Democracy," states with particular reference to the public university but not limited to it: " * * * our public institutions have been imbued by a spirit of liberalism and democracy * * * As they spread westward, grew in number, and throve in vigor, they lent support to the abiding doctrines of democracy." [1]

At the same time, centuries of university tradition could not be denied; there continued a persistent yet unclear attachment to teaching and scholarship. As the modern university grew larger and multiplied its functions, a creative tension organized around two polar positions: one, the classic aims of generating and sharing knowledge; the other, the application of knowledge to solving problems in the national and now international interest. Today, this tension looms as a significant strain. New demands for services pour in to test the university's every commitment. They have come all at once: wave after wave of new students, massive research programs for the national interests, multiplying manpower requests, the pull of knowledge to vexing public problems, gratifying swells of interest in the creative arts, and legions of adult learners in pursuit of lifelong education.[2]

---

[1] Allan Nevins, "The State Universities and Democracy," Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962, p. 2.

The university has tried to serve them all. In the process it has permitted its planning functions to weaken and has accepted a piecemeal if not ramshackle pattern of support. The widening disparity between university support, university intent, and public demand is a question of substantial urgency for sociologists and others concerned with building and improving institutions in the world community. Part of this urgency flows from fundamental shifts in the nature of knowledge which the universities have been chiefly instrumental in bringing about without fully comprehending the implications of these shifts for the institutions themselves. To such shifts, I now turn briefly.

THE UNIVERSITY AND KNOWLEDGE

First, the way in which knowledge is used has changed profoundly. In addition to the changing volume of knowledge and those devices which improve its manipulation, flow, and retrieval, a fundamental shift has occurred in the qualitative relationships between problems and solutions. Modern problems, well illustrated in the technical, military, and diplomatic issues of the international sector, become general and interdependent; the available solutions grow specific and discrete. Decisionmakers in both domestic and international enterprise toil today with the enigma of how to fit them together. The discriminating agent in modern problem-solving has become the university.

Second, regardless of the cultural differences, the world community seems universally involved with the basic relation of human ability to economic growth. It is expressed in every theory of social and economic development. Forewarned by Adam Smith when he spoke of the workman's dexterity as equal to the machine or instrument of trade, present understanding speaks of social capital as an investment in human resources. The evidence suggests that at least half of the economic growth not directly the result of the traditional inputs of capital, land, and labor is due to improvements in educational levels and manpower skills. One important result of this relationship of skill to economic growth is the stronger role of the university as the central supplier of competence.[3]

Third, the rapid improvements in communication have stimulated a widespread diffusion of knowledge from the few who produce it to masses of people far removed from its source. This diffusion reveals the contrasts in the quality of life, creates an awareness of levels of living as political goals, and even accelerates this awareness beyond old traditions and institutions. B. F. Hoselitz comments accordingly: "It is possible that the content of men's minds may be altered somewhat independently of changes in structures and institutions."[4]

---

[2] See, for example, D. B. Henry, "What Priority for Education?" Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1951; S. E. Harris, "More Resources for Education," New York: Harper and Bros., 1960; J. B. Conant, "Shaping Educational Policy," New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

[3] T. W. Schultz, "The Economic Value of Education," New York: Columbia University Press, 1963; F. Harbison and C. A. Myers, "Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth," New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964; "Investment in Human Beings," supplement to the "Journal of Political Economy," vol. 70, No. 5, October 1962; E. Staley, "The Future of Underdeveloped Countries: Political Implications of Economic Development," New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1961.

[4] B. F. Hoselitz, "Sociological Aspects of Economic Growth," Glencoe: the Free Press, 1960, p. 43.

Every university has been instrumental in this diffusion. It seems certain that universities everywhere will become eventually an interdependent and worldwide system by which to advance the process more quickly and systematically.

Fourth, substantial changes in the organization and location of intelligence tend to follow the worldwide migration of people from rural villages to urban centers. Both the advanced and the developing countries share the curious divergence between the concentration of intellectual resources in urban centers and depleted institutions of economic and political life in rural areas. The modern university, as a bridge between the old and the new, has become a chief center for understanding this international phenomenon.

Fifth, if there has been a recent change in the fundamental meaning of the university at all, it has been in a decline of self-generated commitments to scholarly pursuits and an increase in stylized projects. The enormous governmental establishment today, including a structure of sponsorship between governments and universities for services in the national interest, has featured the university as an adjunct of governmental responsibility. In short, the necessary uses of knowledge make contemporary action difficult without the involvement of higher education.

The foregoing points suggest why the contemporary shifts in the nature of knowledge and its use are influential forces in stimulating the new public prominence—both nationally and internationally—of the university. Indeed, some would advance and others would deny that it is proper for modern society to be organized around the universities. As John W. Gardner, on the occasion of introducing James Perkins as the new president of Cornell University, was moved to say:

> * * * as industry and government, with their huge research and educational programs, come to look more and more like the universities, and as the universities with their wordly interests come to look more and more like the rest of society, we shall achieve a condition in which no one will be quite sure what is university and what is non-university and no one will have the faintest idea what is organized around what.[5]

THE UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE

The remarks turn now to the response which the university is making to this growing prominence in national and international affairs. They suggest that the response is less innovative than the changing forces upon the university have required. The remarks will comment about a threefold response: First, the difficulty of long-term planning of international goals; second, the improvisation of activity; and, third, the unusual dependence upon the agent-client technique to gain support.

University planning

Although changes in size and function have made long-term planning by universities more and more necessary, it appears certain that its achievement becomes increasingly difficult. A good example of this deficiency is found in the international field. Many authorities have pointed out the difficulty of universitywide planning in international affairs, as well as the reconciliation of such aims with those associated with other functions. In addition, international activity by the universities has achieved only uncertain acceptance by subunits; much of it has been secured and sustained by administrative practice at the universitywide level. Certain reasons are suggestive.

---

[5] J. W. Gardner, "The Future of the University," Saturday Review, vol. 46, Nov. 2, 1963, p. 46.

1. While research and scholarly achievement measures the current performance of the academic man, the organizing principle of the university remains the instruction of students. The anachronism which results finds academic activity stylized by extensive specialization with an orientation to national and supranational interests. Neal Gross, in a paper presented to this association in 1961, entitled "Organizational Lag in Universities," said this:

> * * * although the value and reward system of the university now gives highest priority to the advancement of knowledge among its several objectives, the organizational setup as relates to the great majority of the permanent faculty members in most universities is one that is still basically geared to function as an agency whose primary function is the transmission of knowledge.[6]

Accordingly, the planning of international programs has been confronted with a demand for group goals and a procedure which yields individualistic goals.

2. While new duties have been added to a narrowly conceived organization, the haphazard dispersion of power in the universities has continued. When departmental units fail to respond to new obligations, other pseudodepartmental units were created. Their legitimacy rests more with administrative power than with faculty power.[7] Also, such units tend to rest at the borders of the university enterprise. It is there that they connect with the larger society and are sustained by attention and support of administrative agents. This is one reason why the administrator has become more instrumental and less integrative in the planning process.

3. Coincidental with such trends in university life, the new programs in international affairs tend to be assigned to discrete and recently established units. How to relate them in a coherent set of aims remains a troublesome question. For example, courses in international topics stimulate relatively few students to serious international interest. Foreign student and visitor projects tend to be sponsored by special centers. Technical assistance projects, while drawing on departmental competence, are negotiated, contracted, staffed, and evaluated by special offices and personnel. If the topics are disciplinary in nature, research may be conducted in departments but it will be supported normally by other arrangements. Area studies have tended to find their home in the specialized institute.

Improvisation

A second response of the university to public prominance is its remarkable improvisation of activitiy. It is the corollary of deficiency in planning. Such improvisation is also influenced by the sudden and extensive support for specific projects in the public welfare, from the swiftness of events, and from the vast number of organizations which surround the university system and stimulate its work. A few additional points offer detail.

---

[6] Neal Gross, "Organizational Lag in American Universities," Harvard Educational Review, vol. 33, 1963, p. 63.

[7] See R. L. Mooney, "The Problem of Leadership in the University," ibid., pp. 42–57.

1. While no certain way exists to weigh the international activity of American universities, and the support for it, its growth may well exceed all other functions in a small number of larger institutions. The size of the current investment, as for example with the foreign student program, is unclear. But there are clues to be sure. The Agency for International Development doubled its dollar obligation to American universities from 1961 to 1964. The number of contracts increased by about the same extent. However, the number of universities holding contracts moved in the same period from 58 to only 72. One must conclude that substantial support of international effort is being utilized by a relatively small number of institutions.[8]

2. Federal support tends to sustain improvisation. Two reasons stand out: (1) Educational and research assistance in connection with the developing countries is coupled with international diplomacy and military defense; and (2) the legislative practice of debating annually the foreign aid category of the Federal budget inclusive of research and education. Accordingly, the quality of Federal-university relationships is characterized by action rather than by reflection, and by short-term tactics rather than long-term strategies.[9]

3. The private foundations and the special councils and institutes must also be added. Their count is infinite: For example, the Institute of International Education, Council on Student Travel, Board of Foreign Scholarships, Education and World Affairs, UNESCO, the World and International Development Banks, special councils devoted to religious and welfare programs, and many psuedoacademic institutes which deal with specific geographical and topical areas of interest. Such groups form one of the chief supports of international activity in the universities. However, with the possible exception of the private foundations, they do not stimulate total university planning. Indeed, while such groups stress novelty and the governmental interest stresses short-term action, the two together often reduce total planning rather than encourage it. These supporting groups have a few if any local connections: while they are inspired for international purposes, they are located nationally. Conversely, and not unrelated, local groups which support the university's other duties have remained largely disinterested in the international aim.

The client relationship

The third response of the university to the new rise in demand for public service is the somewhat uncritical acceptance of the agent-client technique as the chief way of supporting its work. Almost every aspect of the new public prominence of the university has been secured by a method which assigns a quantity of resources to the university in return for an equal quantity of specified services. This technique has improved vastly the experience of the American university in serving the national and international welfare, and it has enlarged enormously the intellectual versatility of the country for both national development and international involvement. However, its present extensiveness forewarns us of its chief defect: Asking for the return of services almost equal to what is provided initially in resoures.

---

[8] Proceedings, Conference on International Rural Development, 1964, Washington: Agency for International Development, 1964, pp. 155–157.

[9] Note the general concern for this in the now classic J. W. Gardner, "AID and the Universities," a report from Education and World Affairs in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, New York: Education and World Affairs, March 1964.

Certain unrewarding consequences may now be identified. These include the splintering of total university effort in ways not always attuned to the aims of the university as a whole, the engendering of a national system of faculty rewards which negates the historic idea of a community of scholars, and the gradual hardening of research practice in a manner that it is not always at home with spirited teaching.

In the international field, the agent-client technique has not enabled the universities to deepen reserve strengths in a way that the size of the activity would have suggested. Although a new concern is apparent, the agent-client technique looms as a profound limitation to the total involvement of the university in the world community. The concern is expressed well in the quotation from Gardner's "AID and the Universities:" "The main purpose in AID's acting to strengthen the universities is not only to serve the national interest broadly conceived, but to enable these institutions to serve AID itself more effectively, now and in the future. In both the short and long run, AID itself will benefit if the universities gain in their total capacity to deal with the international dimension of their interests." [10]

This threefold response of the American university to its increased public prominence resembles the response of the governmental agency to the shorter-term demands for service in the national interest. During the period of this response—the past 20 years—a paradox has emerged to confront the university in all of its hopes to serve the national and international communities alike. On the one hand, the university has aspired to standards based on the historic principles of all university life. Yet, on the other hand, the means to achieving this aspiration, due to internal and external failures to accommodate itself as a total enterprise, have been those of an agency with narrowly conceived objectives. The paradox suggests a fresh review of just what gifts the university is in best position to bring to the development of the world community.

BASIC ATTRIBUTES

First, in a manner which few other entities may claim, the university leans to the whole view as a principal objective. While it both stores and generates new knowledge, the university also blends knowledge. Such processes are designed to be impersonal, conscious of and even sympathetic to public crisis, yet detached from it. The intramural reflections of the university engender a poise in society while demonstrating the rational and humane qualities of high performance. Such conditions as these processes may require must be arranged largely by the university itself.

Second, the university faces both to the past and to the future. It is never free of the former nor is it able to fully accommodate the latter. Thus, it serves as a bridge between the meaning of human achievement and the nature of new explorations into matters of value. The leaders of the next generation, whether for national or international activity, are university students today. This places the university at once a generation ahead and a generation behind. Hence, it is at its best when it insists upon the long-term view. But it is a stance which requires unusual forbearance by society.

---

[10] Ibid., pp. 11–12.

Third, the university possesses an unusual capacity to withstand crisis. Because it may generate its own internal aims, it may insulate itself with reference to external uncertainty. Thus, it may combine tension within itself with calmness in relation to society. This ability to survive in the face of external crisis justifies the founding of universities in the developing countries of the world as much as any other reason. In addition to serving as key centers of development in the countries which have them, universities tend to survive and therefore to add continuity amid rapid changes in economic and political life.

Fourth, although the habit of thinking about universities emphasizes the single institution, one of the great historical means for rational discourse is the international community of scholars. It has always been so; it is even more so today. In the present epoch of nationalism, it is possible that the chief example of world community is found in the growing exchanges between scholars, international symposia, and coordinate acts of academic importance in many different countries. Accordingly, since universities share a world-wide ethic that research and scholarship are non-partisan and nonideological, the future importance of these international dialogues to the hope of a world community is inestimable.

Fifth, since universities provide the most highly educated people in society, they produce and then maintain ties with the professions and the elite; hence, the status attached to universities in every society. At the same time, if learning according to the widest range of viewpoints is tolerated within them, the university will join science to humaness, technology to the aim of serving people, philosophical sweep to the patient empiricism of revealing the darkest corners of social and economic life. Thus universities represent perhaps the best means of sharing discoveries with the common culture. No more forceful attribute may universities share with the world community than the ability to maintain ties to both the elite and the common culture.

AREAS OF NEEDED INNOVATION

The closing remarks of the paper, devoted to the disparity between public commitment by the universities and their disposition to respond imaginatively in finding ways to achieve it, turn briefly to four major areas in which innovation is required. Special reference is made to the international field.

Planning

American universities are under great pressure to come up with inventive techniques in university planning. Not only does the growth of university involvement in international affairs depend on such improvement in planning activity, so do all those other functions of the modern university which currently require reconciliation. Unfortunately, other than novel developments at the interdisciplinary level and experiments with the English collegial system, little experimentation is under way today with massive reconsideration of university structure and how it may lend itself to more effective planning by the enterprise as a whole. Certain suggested approaches follow:

1. Major reforms are required in the structure and operation of perhaps the most retarded aspect of the modern university—faculty government. Apart from its several inadequacies as a body which represents any constituency or opinion, modern faculty government—largely an unwieldy stimulator of short-term tensions on the irrational basis—fails utterly as a device of long-term planning. Accordingly, there is desperate need today for new university groups, not unlike the planning commissions of major municipal centers, which incorporate representatives of the major interest groups and functions of the university.

2. Vital to the planning effort, yet still primitively expressed in most American universities, is how best to relate the budget, as a fiscal statement of program, to both the organizing principles of the university and its major aims. If the budget is to become responsive to what the university proposes to accomplish, it is imperative that improved ways be found clearly to identify and communicate the aims of a given university, encourage identifiable categories of facutly specialization, and establish workable reward systems at the departmental level which give impetus to overall university aims.

3. Contemporary events on the American academic scene underscore the great need of sweeping reforms aimed to clarify the nature and limits of power in the university. The extent and the quality of the commitment by every university are determined today by the most whimiscal and uncertain of processes. It is unlikely that the spread of international activity beyond the handful of American universities will take place until a more carefully reasoned reflection about its place in university life is made by trustees, faculty, students, administrators, and the various publics.

With substantial improvements in overall university planning, it is to be hoped that the international challenge will not only be enlarged but will become a more natural aim of each and all sectors of the university.

Research

The second area of needed innovation refers to an improvement in the scholarly and research effort of the universities in the international field. Due largely to the agent-client technique of support, to the disinclination of Federal agencies and other supporting groups to support basic international research, and to the disinterest of the universities with inventing additional techniques of support, it is doubtful that any effort of the American university has emerged with less emphasis on research than the international field.

1. By means of greater scope of interest on the parts of the Federal Government, foundations, and other related organizations, more colleges and universities should be supported for research and scholarship which offer opportunities of faculty enrichment rather than direct contributions to national objectives abroad. Even nominal support of research in a substantial number of institutions will provide an economic and feasible way of enlarging the international competence of higher education in the United States. At the same time, with the added use of consortia-like arrangements, it will give the so-

ciety at large a much greater reserve strength for its international commitments in the long run.

2. More thought must be given soon to how best to stimulate research along both disciplinary and area lines. It is proper and normal that the university prefers to organize research effort by means of the basic disciplines. However, much of the national need, at least in the manner by which knowledge is retrieved necessarily must stress given areas of the world. New organizational arrangements are much in order, perhaps by joint sponsorship of the Federal Government and the universities. For example, attention should be given to new types of Federal centers, located and organized as adjuncts to universities, which could combine the best of disciplinary and area research. Such centers have been made workable in other fields.

3. In order that recognition may be given to the improbability of many individual institutions gaining independently strong competence in international affairs, it seems certain that extensive interuniversity and college arrangements will be necessary. Accordingly, it is to be hoped that Government and foundation sources may develop special forms of encouraging experimentation. These arrangements should include institutions in both the developing and the advanced countries, in order that such techniques as joint appointments among two or more universities may take place regardless of location.

4. Within the institution-building activities of the present day, more attention is required of how best to establish research practice abroad. In spite of the prodigious effort in developing countries by American universities, a distinct lack of permanent research institutions now remaining in foreign universities has resulted. Although research is perhaps the chief feature of the modern American university, it has not been transplanted successfully abroad.

Host country planning

The third area of needed innovation deals with more refined techniques of country planning which involves host countries, the United States, other countries, American and other universities. Although progress is underway, American universities have been too little involved with the early planning of country-wide objectives. If American universities are to make a long-term commitment to work abroad in a university-like manner, they will need to exhibit a greater concern about the relevance of their services.

1. Sociologists have a special part to play in assessing the past effectiveness of inserting U.S. experience into various cultural settings. It is doubtful that leaders of university projects abroad have been willing to vary their practice sufficiently to make the necessary sociocultural adaptations and linkages. Such inflexibility has been increased by reason of delayed participation and a frequent lack of familiarity with the country's objectives as they may pertain to the project.

2. In many of the developing countries, two or more ways of conducting the university enterprise have been accepted by the same country. A leading example is the present reconciliation underway in Africa between the patterns of higher education in Great Britain and and the United States. If university life and service are made distinctive and relevant in the developing countries, more thought must

be given to how best differing patterns of higher education may be incorporated with indigenous experiences quite early in country planning.

International education

The fourth area of needed innovation relates to vast improvements in sharing the growing international experiences of American universities with the people in this country. The experiences are sufficient already for mounting a vigorous effort in adult education—one which could become one of the great liberalizing movements in our society. The following suggestions move to this point.

1. Much more attention must be paid to how best returning faculty members from abroad, foreign students, and foreign-born members of the staff may share their points of view in more and better extramural opportunities. This fund of international competence is failing to work itself into the teaching program on the campus and into community life generally. It is also apparent that such competence is neither being utilized on a continuing basis by governmental agencies nor sustained and enriched by carefully conceived staff development programs by the universities. Having gained a significant experience abroad, a faculty member should be encouraged by consulting and research opportunities to remain current on topics and areas of international endeavor.

2. Since the support for international projects comes mainly from nationally oriented agencies, too little time and inclination have characterized the efforts to acquaint local publics about the university mission abroad. Due to the complex structure of support for the American university, it is unlikely that a permanent commitment to the world community will occur until its importance is understood and accepted by all aspects of the structure. Indeed, the difficulties attending to total university planning today spring in part from an unreconciled basis of support—teaching provided for by local approval and support, research by specialized public agencies, and international projects by a host of nationally placed agencies in both the public and private sectors * * *.

The current promise of university activity in developing world community is influenced positively by the cycles through which it has moved in the past 20 years. Following World War II, emphasis was given to rebuilding the countries of Europe which were ravaged by war. The emphasis shifted later to direct inputs on the technological level—agriculture, public health, public works, and transportation systems. More recently the emphasis is on that to which the universities may extend the most effective assistance—launching and sponsoring new educational institutions in the developing countries.

The tenor of these remarks has indicated a hope for more imaginative stocktaking by the universities at a time when they are accepting an enormous public commitment. It is also to be hoped that a healthy regard for experimentation (and trial and error) will continue. Even with rapid innovation along the above lines, the role of the university in developing world community will be far from certain. R. H.

Thayer, in an article entitled "Does Higher Education Have Obligations in Relation to Political Objectives Abroad?", states it this way:

> * * * it is impossible to distinguish between the national and the international. One can no longer consider the one without the other. We have moved into a world that is in the process of definition, and we are called upon to be parties to that definition within our historic traditions. The role of the university in specific terms in this new world has not been defined and can only be defined by the universities under the pressure of events and by such intellectually creative work within the universities as will guide events.[11] (Address, the American Sociological Association, Chicago, Ill., Sept. 2, 1965.)

---

[11] R. H. Thayer, "Does Higher Education Have Obligations in Relation to Political Objectives Abroad?" Department of State Bulletin, vol. 43, Oct. 24, 1960, p. 650.

The Enlisted University

by Steven Muller

Now vice president for public affairs of Cornell University, Mr. Muller served for 4 years as director of that university's Center for International Studies.

A special feature of the process of development is the enormous prominence of the United States. As the world's most affluent and most technologically and industrially advanced nation, we play, of necessity, a leading role in international development. By what we do, or choose not to do, we provide guidance for, or control over, as much of the process of development in many lands as almost any human agency can provide. As a nation we are, of course, ourselves still developing. But to the people less advanced than we, we seem to be in the vanguard of that enormous struggle for a better life in which all of humanity on this globe now believes itself to be engaged. Where we lead, others follow.

This is a responsibility that we have not chosen, but that we cannot escape. Its consequences for us and for everyone else are enormous. Conscious of our historic mission, we have stretched out our helping hand across the globe. Assistance to others has become one of the major features of our national policy. Such assistance is desirable for its own sake. It is also a necessary policy in the context of what we know as the cold war, which is in the largest sense the struggle to enable as many nations as possible to develop industrially and technologically within a climate of freedom. Let us, however, never forget that the fundamental features of our time would be much the same even if there were no Soviet Union and if Karl Marx had never lived. The challenge of international development was not created by communism. We dare not confuse the legitimacy and urgency of that challenge with the secondary fact that our Communist adversaries are trying to use it against us.

For our own sake and that of others, we the people of the United States are racing the revolution of rising expectations. We see it as our task to help others to develop and to offer them protection against the threat of Communist exploitation and betrayal of the process of social revolution.

The task is demanding, enduring, and consuming. To meet it, we have as a society mobilized our great energies. As a nation we have become self-consciously the advance party of a global effort toward the spread of technological development and the achievement by many peoples of maximum material change in the shortest possible time. Our own national resources have become the great arsenal of international development. So great is our sense of dedication to our task that it is not uncommon to find Americans projecting our national image in terms of a crusade, a crusade for a better life for all men, in peace and freedom.

Inevitably the mobilized American society has enlisted our great national universities fully in its service. In these universities our citizens are trained, and they constitute the great storehouses and inventories of learning and knowledge. As is true in all countries and at all times, the universities are in their very nature public institutions, rendering a public service even when they are privately founded and privately endowed. Throughout history they have regarded the general enlightenment as their primary function. Society turns to them naturally and inevitably for service and training. Inescapably, then, as the great demands of international development have confronted American society with pressing new needs, the country has turned to the universities for the answer to these needs. And the universities have responded.

So much, however, has happened so quickly that it is both necessary and useful to take stock of the degree to which the colleges have been enlisted in the great national cause, and to assess what this enlistment means to America's universities. The process began quite naturally during the Second World War. Here was a wartime situation, with the country mobilized to win the war. The universities were naturally enlisted in the great effort to train the men needed to fight and win the war. What is so remarkable about the postwar period is that the pressure upon the universities has not once let up in the years since Hitler's war ended. As a matter of fact, it has on the whole increased and intensified rather than lessened. The Nation is no longer mobilized for war, but it is still mobilized, and the universities find themselves still enlisted. As a result, an atmosphere of continuing crisis and pressure permeates the university community. It may be instructive to analyze the pressures upon the universities in terms of the similar pressures that are taken for granted in time of war, but that we have only recently become accustomed to living with in time of peace.

Thus, during war it is common to find university faculties raided to satisfy the needs of society. Men of military age will be drafted directly into the armed services. In other cases the very best brains are quite naturally called upon to serve the country where they are most needed. As we all know, this process now continues in peacetime. Faculty members are not precisely drafted into the military services, but they are drafted into the national cause. Happily, in most cases nowadays it is not necessary for people to absent themselves completely from the faculty in order to serve the country as well. But if someone were to make a roster of the number of faculty members at any great university who serve the Nation as consultants on problems of national importance, the list would be staggering. Particularly is this so in contrast to the degree to which such service was expected of university faculties in times gone by.

Again, during the war the physical facilities of universities were overtaxed by the advent of students in large numbers. Such men required training for the national military effort. As our growing society in peacetime seeks to continue to train the largest possible number of future leaders and public servants in all capacities of life, the relentless pressure of student numbers on our universities has not for one instant lessened. It continues to grow and grow. The wartime parallels can be continued. Quite obviously the special demands placed on the universities require special means of support. New funds and new sources of funds are required to provide for the most pressing needs that society expects the universities to fulfill. Just as in wartime special funds had to be provided for such programs as V–12, V–5, or ASTP, so the mobilized society of today has found it possible to rely on the great foundations, and on State and Federal Governments, to provide the funds for new programs that the universities are being asked, urged, implored, to undertake. It is, however, worthwhile noting that these funds are provided specifically for the particular project that seems socially desirable. They are not free funds going to strengthen institutions as such. These dollars are mobilization money, designed to finance what is deemed a most pressing need, but without much regard for the balance of effort within the university as a whole in what used to be regarded as normal times and circumstances.

New types of training also appear to be desirable. This in peacetime, of course, is not training for a direct military purpose. And it is obvious that in the context of our modern society, new disciplines have arisen and flourish without the special impetus of mobilization for international development. These include such novel fields of specialized study as public and business administration, industrial and labor relations, and hotel administration. But to these are now added special new needs, such as programs in international agricultural development, international nutrition, special courses in planning and development economics, and an exploding demand in linguistics. Let me illustrate the burden of this aspect of university enlistment with just one example: the most recent survey indicates that under the special terms of the National Defense Education Act, 46 university centers established under the act now offer a total of 1,200 courses in more than 40 languages, involving over 600 faculty members and more than 7,000 students.

In addition, even more than in wartime, direct oversea services are expected of the universities by our mobilized society. Through Federal agencies such as the Agency for International Development, contracts are offered to assist educational institutions in the developing countries. Thus Cornell as a typical American university now has a contract to assist the University of Liberia, has completed a contract to assist the College of Agriculture of the University of the Philippines, and is assisting specialized component schools of universities in Chile and in Turkey. On a national basis, the Agency for International Development reports, as of June 30 of this year, current contract operations involving 88 universities, holding a total of 107 contracts worth altogether $110 million and assisting 37 different countries.

Finally, just as in wartime certain special training is required, either for particular individuals or particular groups, that can find no place even in an expanding or exploding curriculum, so this pressure continues in peacetime. Public servants come up from Washington to study a particular language or to become involved in an area studies program. Entire groups come to pursue special studies, such as the volunteers for the Peace Corps pursued at Cornell and at other universities this past summer and during the academic year. And just as we trained allies in wartime, so in peacetime, in the age of international development, almost an army of foreign students has descended on the American university campus, to share at various levels in programs of advanced training.

Thus the university is enlisted today, just as much as it was in wartime, in the new effort to which our country is dedicated. And this is essentially fine and proper. It is an obligation which no university can legitimately avoid, and which almost all have greeted quite properly with vigor and enthusiasm. Nevertheless, there are some second thoughts on this process that ought not always to be suppressed. It is in the first place necessary for us to understand that the universities have not returned to normalcy, and to understand, all of us, the enormous pressure under which universities continue to operate.

And ultimately it must be remembered that the university is not merely a resource for the active and action needs of a society, even though it is inevitably, necessarily, and wholesomely such a resource in part. The teaching and research which are essential business of the university involve public service. But they involve also ideas and reflection. The need for action does not reduce the importance of the need to think, the time to think, and the freedom to think. The university is, after all, a place to ask questions, to look deeply. This is what young minds, and the minds of the scholars who teach them, are expected to do. Yet in our time, with its sense of urgency, there is a danger that this reflective or questioning function is not as fully appreciated as it should be on the outside, nor as appreciated, or even fully practiced, within the institutions of learning as one might wish. If this is true the reflecting and reflective function is therefore more crucial than ever.

Quite deliberately in this short address I have been using military images and metaphors. I have spoken of mobilization and enlistment, of arsenals and advance parties, and have equated the contemporary pressures upon the university with those usually exerted only during the national emergency of war. My reason for doing so is to emphasize a crucial and basic question implicit in this terminology: as a society we are on the march, but how clearly have we in view the goal toward which we are marching? Mobilization is a huge effort. It is so huge, in fact, that it tends to generate a momentum of its own. The harnessing of great human energies tends to put a premium on action for its own sake. As a great joint effort of people together perists and matures, there is the danger that it will generate its own ephemeral values and attitudes. The pressures to remain in line and in step become more intense over time; tempers grow shorter as strain goes on longer; tolerance lessens, and an authority-centered garrison mentality may appear. When this point is reached, the purity of dedication which launched a great effort will become stained.

In today's world, the American people have girded their loins to improve the human condition. However, in our effort we encounter not only the obstacle of great needs, but also the competition of a hostile and powerful political system. There is, then, inevitably the danger that our effort will be drawn off its primary goal into mere competition. Our mission is essentially a positive one, and it is its positive character that sustains us as a great people. Perhaps the greatest danger we face is that our effort may decay into something negative and sterile—routine, disoriented, and defensive. To prevent this decay, we must encourage and heed those who are free to remind us of our basic purpose. Quintessentially what is at stake in the effort for which America has mobilized is not the rest of the world, but the fate and future of our own society. That society needs above all to retain the purity and vigor of its purpose. And for this vital need it relies inevitably on the universities, who train the ablest and the most mature of the young and who harbor free and critical inquiry. No other need of society dares transcend this absolute obligation of the university.

I should not wish to be misunderstood. I believe firmly in the great cause of human betterment for which our society is mobilized. And I believe fully in the need of our universities to serve this cause. It is healthy for the universities to be pragmatic, to be flexible, to be adaptable. They are enriched by the many new things they have been asked to do. They are thriving under the pressure that has been put on them. Just as individuals do, they too grow as they respond to challenge. But for institutions as well as for individuals, the Shakespearean adage from Hamlet holds true, the adage which reminds us "To thine own self be true." In the crisis-ridden circumstances of our time, it requires a special kind of courage for the American university to be true to itself, to its mission, and thus to American society. It requires the courage to insist on the necessity for freedom of inquiry, freedom of learning, freedom to ask, to seek, to teach. It requires, above all, firmness in the insistence on the best interests of the university, as a university, in the face of all the pressures brought to bear. The crucial freedoms today that the universities must have include the freedom to say no to some demands that will be placed; the freedom to reject the strings that are inevitably tied to certain kinds of support; the freedom also to continue to question everything, above all the orthodoxy of those in power and the orthodoxy of the everyday.

To be true to itself, the university must continue always to know and to believe that the oldest duty for which the university is liable and has been conscripted by society since the days of the first academy is to serve not only as the teacher of society but as its conscience. This is the Socratic legacy, and we at the university and our society abandon it or slight it as our mutual peril. More pressing than all the new needs that our society demands of us is that we in the universities pay heed to this first duty, to continue to be the place of free inquiry, free thinking, and free judgment. Only if we cleave to this first purpose can we fulfill truly the terms of our enlistment. All those of us in the university community must understand this duty because we all share in it and we must all perform it. It behooves us then, as we do in our teaching and symbolically in our buildings, to blend the old and the new, in our purpose, in our duty, and in our obligation to the society which nurtures us and which we serve. As the university does this, it will be true to itself. It will fulfill nobly the terms of its unique enlistment in our time. And it must follow as the night the day, it cannot then be false to any man, or the the great cause of human development and betterment. (Address, 12th annual meeting of the Cornell University Council, Ithaca, N.Y., October 5–6, 1962.)

The International Programs of American Universities

by the Institute of Advanced Prcjects, East-West Center[1]

In 1958 Edward W. Weidner carried out for the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs of Michigan State University an inventory and analysis which was published in book form as "The International Programs of American Universities." A revised inventory and analysis was carried out during 1964–1965 by the Office of Reference Research and Information, Institute of Advanced Projects, East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, with aid from Education and World Affairs. This updated survey will be published in late 1966 by Michigan State University.

Both the 1958 and 1966 studies define international programs from an exchange orientation, and thus do not include the full range of international curricular programs, such as area and language centers, or many international campus activities. Nonetheless, the 1966 findings evidence a phenomenal growth in the number of formal and informational international affiliations, exchanges, contracts and institutional arrangements entered into by U.S. universities and colleges. For the latest survey, 2,178 college and university presidents were contacted, and from them there was a 99 percent response.

In 1958 some 184 universities reported 382 programs, but in 1965 we have identified 1,319 programs in 396 institutions. This quantitative development carries qualitative significance, and many factors revealed by this directors bear more analysis than is afforded here. What does this increase mean? Are the same universities multiplying their efforts? Are new institutions now involved? What regions of the United States are more active? Why is there a veritable "study abroad explosion" and it is educationally healthy?

What factors within universities determine international activity or inactivity? What can we learn by comparing data on university leadership, structures, faculty participation, or student response? Harvard has 36 programs, but this fact could be ascribed to special wealth and excellence. However, the Universities of Indiana, California, Hawaii, Wisconsin, and Texas have 25 or more. It is interesting to compare Michigan State University, which has an enrollment of 28,826 students and conducts 20 programs, with the City University of New York, which has a combined enrollment of 84,994 in its Brooklyn, City, Hunter, and Queens Colleges, but reports no programs. Should one infer that New Yorkers are less interested in the world than Michigan faculty and students? Is there a difference in leadership, conception of higher education, or administrative structure? It is a fact, for instance, that Michigan State University "studied" possible patterns for 2 years and subsequently instituted a dean of international affairs, with an associate dean in each college, to implement its international commitment—whereas the City University of New York has no administrative officer charged with international program responsibilities.

---

[1] © To be published by Michigan State University. Reprinted by permission.

Can this program activity itself be evaluated? Are there some institutions without sufficient resources for international programs undertaking them because international activity is in vogue, because it is a bandwagon of intellectual prestige? Are some institutions, on the other hand, allocating their excellent international program resources externally and to the detriment of their chief educative functions?

Are there changes in areas of the world cooperatively involved? Are there new kinds of programs? What is the significance of the large number of "cooperative arrangements" found this time? Have curriculums been modified as the result of international programs? In short, in what ways has American higher education responded to the reality of an increasingly international society, and what is the nature of these new thrusts?

What does seem clear is that American higher education has burst its classroom walls and campus boundaries. The "cloisters" may remain useful in aiding the organization and expression of knowledge, but they cannot help professors and students in seeking and experiencing all the varied and changing human existence that is the stuff of knowledge and its effective applications. Itching feet and itching minds have found new passports to the unknown, governments, foundations, businesses, universities, and individuals themselves increasingly willing and able to supply the funds for international activities. The 382 programs reported in 1958 represented an ideological commitment and allocation of resources. The 1,319 reported here speak for an even more significant involvement—varying on a spectrum of educational soundness.

World politics and the role of the United States in international affairs have undoubtedly enlarged American higher education's frame of reference. Moreover, our growing concern, hunger for expanded knowledge, and aroused sense of adventure have been aided by an era of affluence enabling thousands of academics to go abroad, with institutional support or on their own. Previously some teachers of French managed to experience France, but today many students can, too. Indeed, there are many graduate departments whose student-specialists in any kind of international studies are expected to work in the field as part of their degree requirements. Finally, there are also those thousands of professors and students who quite simply want to see and experience the world or some part of it.

Perhaps the most potent catalysts within the United States have been the foreign students, now annually populating our campuses in numbers exceeding 100,000. Americans who think they will learn the "truth" about other cultures from their nationals are naive, but many do come to learn truths, untruths, and half-truths through primary experiences with human beings of varying hues and beliefs. The outer world is no longer satisfying merely in books, or even in television. A student can reach out to a world his campus, or a campus can bring the world into its own domain.

Most recently in the evolution of international higher education, the skills of our university personnel have been needed in overseas technical assistance programs. Many of the administrators, professors, and graduate students involved have found themselves as much learners as teachers or consultants, and most development programs today involve cooperative international teams. Further, much of what we are learning has begun to modify institutional aims and practices at home. By now, for instance, "ceremonies" is incomplete without multinational and international content, and "development economics" is but one of many new fields in higher education. Within this new field, incidentally, both the subfields of macro- and micro-planning are now being applied to domestic economics—the United States benefiting from approaches born in "technical assistance to underdeveloped nations."

We pointed out that classrooms have burst their walls and campuses their boundaries, but it is also fair to say they have been breached. American and foreign adult professionals in many fields—especially related to Government agencies and industrial concerns—are enrolled in university courses, workshops, and seminars. In fact, two classical academic terms—curriculum and student—have lost, or enlarged, their meaning. The only definitions that seem to be accurate today are that all learning is curricular and that all learners are students. The significant point here is that so much of this learning relates to professions becoming cross-cultural and international.

We are impressed with our increasing need to know what is happening in our universities. We need to know in a total sense—in relation to program decisions and resource allocations—but it is also obvious that many of our most distinguished (and complex) universities do not have organized data on what their own institutions are doing, why, and with what results. The arduous, and far from accurate methodology of this inquiry—involving two major questionnaires, coding, and computer analysis procedures—leads us to plead for a more modern technique of data recording. If we wish to be precise and efficient in evaluations based on data retrieval, as electronic devices now make possible, it is logical that we be precise and efficient in data recording. Decision making in relation to modern social networks demands "instant data."

We are pleased to have discovered and presented so much data and we are satisfied that some resultant interpretations are valid and useful, but undoubtedly the most important questions have not been posed or answered. Higher education is essentially conservative, and queries relating to the classical academic structures, disciplines, and methodologies in relation to current intellectual thrusts and social needs are only in early ferment. Professors and students today, for example, tend to identify less with their campus institutions than with their professions and professional implementation. Considerable academic prestige is now accorded Fulbright scholars, Guggenheim fellows, East-West Center senior specialists, U.S. AID consultants, or Ford Foundation foreign area specialists. Higher education is clearly participant to a concept of human community that now involves both international studies and international cooperation * * *.

ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY: INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM TRENDS

Growth and change are characteristic of American universities, and the phenomenal development of international programs is quantified by a comparison of 1957–58 and 1964–65 data:

TABLE 1-A.—*The international programs of American universities*

	1957–58	1964–65	Percent increase
Number of universities	1,946	2,094	+7.6
Universities with programs	184	396	+115.2
Number of programs	382	1,319	+245.3

Most of these programs have been developed since World War II, and indeed since 1950. * * * Prior to that time the relatively few programs were largely the result of individual interest on the part of American faculty members. In some cases the programs involved affiliations arranged by foreign alumni of American colleges or universities. More complex institutional relationships, such as Yale in China, were rare.

The 1957–58 analysis revealed the institutionalized structures becoming characteristic of international programs, a development further reinforced by these 1964–65 data. Colleges and universities are no longer isolated citadels of learning: they increasingly operate within related social networks—local, national, and international. Particularly as regards international programs, the allocation of new and generous funding sources has undergirded the enlarging concept of knowledge. In fact, study or research abroad is almost assuming a "human right" level among academics, and the recruiting of academics has become "standard operations" in Government agencies, foundations, and other institutions. The role of the intellectual is no longer limited to Academe—the academic goes out in the world and brings the world onto campus and into classroom.

In 1965, thus, the number and nature of university international programs reveals more than institutionalization. It is clear these programs are not just "overseas operations" or "international dimensions"—they are becoming normal ingredients of higher education. We offer for discussion and further inquiry the following summary of trends in American universities related to international programs:

1. The growth of international programs is quantitatively obvious, but their qualities are often obscure. Their characteristics can be described, but their excellence ranks from superficial to sound curriculum, improvements toward soundness noticeable.

2. As international programs are further institutionalized, many universities have created new administrative positions in order to facilitate and coordinate their programs. There may be a correlation of professional administration to the existence and the excellence of international programs.

3. The institutionalization is taking place not only within institutions of higher education, but cooperatively among them—including some foreign institutions.

4. The programs increasingly involve cooperation with institutions and agencies other than colleges and universities. The two most sig-

nificant groups of sponsors are U.S. Government agencies and private foundations, but many religious, commercial, and cultural institutions are also significantly participating.

5. Many institutional programs are integral, operational aspects of American universities. It is difficult to separate curricular from noncurricular programs, within or across departments and disciplines. Many new courses, seminars, and workshops have resulted from noncurricular activities.

6. Some of this institutionalization has resulted in the establishment of nondepartmental international or area studies centers or institutes. The social sciences are largely represented, but inter- and multi-disciplinary approaches are increasingly utilized.

7. American universities are significantly involved in assistance to developing countries, via both campus and overseas operations. The skills of American academic personnel, thus, are both utilized and enhanced.

8. As university administrators, faculty, and students increasingly go abroad on short- or long-term assignments connected to development aid, there is a tendency to emphasize research rather than teaching. This growing fund of basic research is providing important foundations of knowledge for both international development and university curriculum.

9. There is a beginning awareness that the knowledge, purposes, and techniques of overseas development are applicable to domestic development. It is possible that the underdeveloped areas of the United States will benefit directly from new research and techniques originally designed for underdeveloped countries.

10. The "study abroad explosion," witnessed in the large numbers of summer study tours and undergraduate "junior year abroad" programs, in part reflects Americans' eagerness to experience other cultures firsthand and thus expand their intellectual and emotional horizons. This phenomenon could be called a new romantic movement, but there is considerable evidence that it also relates both to a concept of "highly" educated citizens and to interest in international careers. It is important to note that most of the funding for study abroad programs is personal.

11. In many fields the doctoral candidates are being sent abroad individually or in teams for field research or internships. This work abroad is generally not personally funded, and universities are necessarily expanding their financial resources in order to offer international studies that include work in the field. Many doctoral candidates have serious international career expectations and seek overseas preparation.

12. The number of foreign students and professionals on our campuses continues to increase, attesting to the growing international status and professional functionality of American higher education, whether degree or nondegree. It is probable that many come to the United States as students because studentship offers the only avenue to seeing the world in general and the dynamic American culture in particular. Foreign students, too, are adventurous and curious. Often, however, foreign students and professionals on behalf of their careers are specifically seeking education that is "higher" than any available at home.

13. U.S. universities increasingly serve nonacademic groups, especially from Government agencies and business concerns, domestic and foreign. Business and public administration, development economics, labor-industrial relations, and other subdivisions of the social sciences are becoming international in content. As these fields and indeed the natural sciences—the most universal—seek application to different cultural and cross-cultural situations, they perforce have to call on the behavioral sciences in order to apply their fields cross culturally. Some of the new thinking and research in the behavioral sciences thus results from the needs of government and industrial officials preparing or continuing to reside and work abroad.

14. All these thrusts are calling for more fundamental research, not only in the field but also in U.S. university laboratories. Some of the most significant social research in the world is now going on in American universities, multidisciplinary approaches the norm, and new subdisciplines and fields developing rapidly. The number and nature of new fields, as evidenced by doctoral and postdoctoral specializations, is an academic fact of great significance.

This investigation and interpretation of the international programs of American universities is largely quantitative, leading one to the temptation of evaluating on the basis of numbers. There is evidence, however, that many American universities have undergone growth and sophistication in their international activities, any early naive excitement related to overseas operations having given way to hard realism and considerable commitment. For instance, an administrator of a Peace Corps public health program in a Latin American country wrote on his questionnaire "Accomplishments cannot be categorized; they are minor victories tenaciously fought for, fragile beyond belief in a disorganized society such as this."

In sum, this inventory and analysis clearly reveals that these international programs are no longer external aspects of American universities. They are teaching-learning components increasingly functional to higher education. They attest both to intellectuals' search for wider and deeper bases of knowledge and to an impressive American academic contribution to the international conditions of peace. ("The International Programs of American Universities," 1966 edition, Margaret L. Cormack, compiler.)

The University and World Affairs

by The Committee on the University and World Affairs

In July 1959, at the request of the Department of State, the Ford Foundation created a distinguished committee, the members of which were drawn from the universities, foundations, business and government (Chairman: J. L. Morrill, then president of the University of Minnesota), and requested it to focus upon the role of American universities in world affairs. The conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee are contained in the following summary of its report.

The American university is caught in a rush of events that shakes its traditions of scholarship and tests its ability to adapt and grow. The United States is just awakening to the fact that world affairs are not the concern of the diplomat and soldier alone. They involve the businessman, the farmer, the laborer, the economist, the lawyer—indeed, every citizen. And we are discovering that the world includes vast regions and peoples we have little known before.

This American awakening has come along with the upsurge of demands for independence and economic advancement among hundreds of millions abroad who have known little of either. In their own awakening they see education as indispensable to their quest for growth and dignity.

At the center of these new educational demands, all the more pressing because they often coincide with the policy goals of our Government, stands the American university. It is challenged to meet the needs of our own people for a far better knowledge and understanding of others. It is challenged at the same time to help meet the needs of emerging nations for the creation and rapid improvement of whole educational systems.

Whether the rapid technological and social development upon which nations insist will take place by totalitarian regimentation or in conditions of growing individual freedom and responsibility is a crucial question of our times. It is an educational question as well as a social, economic and political question.

The American university is a center both of learning and of service with a public purpose founded upon the traditions of American society and the heritage of other universities in history. It serves the high needs of society, as no other institution can, primarily through its teaching and research. Its scholarship is guided responsibly so as to encounter the great intellectual and educational issues that confront us. Traditionally, the university also engages in other forms of direct service to society, such as extension work, consultation, and assistance to other educational institutions.

The system of land-grant colleges, established a century ago in the United States, is one notable example of adaptation of American institutions of higher learning to meet heavy new demands. At that time, the new task was to provide higher education to the workers and farmers on a developing frontier. At the present time, our universities are called upon to bring knowledge of other peoples into the mainstream of higher education for Americans, and to help educate the leaders and help strengthen the educational institutions of newly developing nations. For American universities this is a further step in the continuing task of expanding the horizons of a free society.

In the postwar years American universities, responding to the Nation's new involvement in world affairs, have taken on many new and expanded activities. These include new courses on Asia, Africa, and the Soviet Union, and U.S. relations with them; research on economic, political, and social development of the newly independent nations; foreign students in large number; and special oversea projects to help build and strengthen educational institutions in other countries.

The universities' response so far, however, has been largely sporadic and unplanned. To meet the challenge of their potential role in world affairs adequately, they now have an historic opportunity to undertake, individually and in cooperation, a major effort as institutions. They have the responsibility, in the best university tradition, to make a contribution which no other institutions can: to enlarge our horizons as a free society, to help educate the leaders and help build the educational foundations of the newer nations, and to cooperate with educational institutions in other nations in order to help create a free international society. These tasks require the sustained participation of the best American university competence and the pioneering of new academic traditions.

Although the opportunities and responsibilities in world affairs may be more striking in the case of American universities, they are only somewhat less important for American colleges.

Reliance by the Federal Government on the help of universities in meeting the Nation's needs in world affairs requires the establishment of new relations between the Government and the universities appropriate to the role of each. In a field of educational activity that vitally concerns our foreign relations and is dependent for its adequacy upon substantial Federal Government support, the national interest both justifies Government support and requires that Government determine the policies under which Government itself participates. In a field in which American institutions of higher learning are themselves the major resource upon which the Nation must continue to depend, universities cannot be expected to serve as mere agents of Government in spite of increased Government support and participation. They must be granted autonomy and long-term assurances of adequate financing if they are to perform the tasks supported by Government in a manner befitting their educational function and purpose.

To help American universities and colleges achieve their unique purposes our educational resources must be strengthened. In a pluralistic society like ours this effort requires a new set of cooperative relationships between universities and colleges and the institutions that call upon and support them—the Federal Government, the States, the foundations, and private enterprise. This is possible in turn only if new organizations are formed in the private sector and within the Government in order to achieve more effective educational leadership in world affairs.

To achieve these ends, the committee believes ~~that~~ there needs to be:

1. *A lifting of sights* that will transcend the traditionally domestic and Western orientation of scholarship and training, in universities and colleges, and the limited aims of "technical assistance" and "national defense," in Government.
2. *Higher priority* for world affairs in education, and for education in the Government's international programs.
3. *Planning for longer term programs* to support universities and colleges at home and to promote educational development abroad.
4. *More effective use of scarce educational resources* through improved organization and cooperation among American institutions and in relation to their counterparts abroad.
5. *A higher quality of educational performance* through the systematic development of American competence for the new, varied, and difficult tasks confronting American institutions of higher learning.
6. *More adequate resources* for these tasks.

To give effect to these policies, the committee recommends that the American institutions concerned with the role of universities and colleges in world affairs undertake the following measures: * * *

Universities and colleges

1. *All American institutions of higher learning should make studies of world affairs an important and permanent dimension of their undergraduate programs.* Such studies should include the role of the United States in world affairs, Western civilization, important non-Western civilizations, foreign languages and problems of international relations, economic growth, social change and order. Study abroad, effectively organized and directed, should be an important and integral part of undergraduate education.

2. *All American universities should improve the competence of their graduate and professional schools to teach and to conduct research on international aspects of their disciplines and professions.*

3. *Many universities (more than at present) should become diversified centers of strength* to train specialists in world affairs for careers in teaching and other professions, government and business; to undertake research; to exercise leadership in language-training and linguistics; to prepare teaching materials for all levels of education; and to open the perspectives of scholarship to other institutions and to adult citizens in their communities. Some centers will focus on particular geographic areas, others on policy problems and functional studies, cutting across disciplinary lines.

4. *Most universities and colleges have students and scholars from other countries. These institutions needs to develop special educational programs fitting the needs of their foreign guests.* At the same time they should integrate these programs as fully as possible with the programs for American students, and with the host institutions' other international programs. Foreign students on American

campuses constitute an educational and cultural resource that universities and colleges should draw on more fully. A high priority should be given to better selection and other measures to improve the quality of the students' educational experience. There is also a pressing need to receive more foreign students. *Problems of quality and quantity require concurrent attention.*

5. *Many universities and colleges would benefit from undertaking cooperative activities with educational institutions in other countries. A few should undertake programs of assistance to educational institutions overseas.* To carry on effectively these increasingly important activities, the participating universities should: develop a high degree of competence on a continuing basis for the particular overseas activities it undertakes; insure the participation of its best faculty members; and relate its overseas activities to its educational program at home for the mutual strengthening of both.

6. *Universities that undertake a wide range of programs in world affairs, at home and abroad, face complex problems of management. Their faculties and administration alike need to develop long-range priorities and plans in order to make the most effective use of their scarce resources and make possible the balanced, yet flexible, growth of the total university educational program.*

The Federal Government

7. *The Congress and the Executive should support, on a continuing and flexible basis, university and college programs to improve the education of Americans in world affairs.* The National Defense Education Act provides a modest precedent for the kind of support that is needed. Support should not be limited to foreign language and area studies, but should be extended to other studies where greater American competence is needed in the national interest. Support should be related to university activities overseas so that domestic and foreign programs are mutually strengthened.

8. *The Congress and the Executive should give much more emphasis to education in programs of foreign assistance.* Requests to American universities for participation in overseas activities should be limited to educational tasks for which the universities are specially suited.

9. *The Congress and the Executive, in authorizing and administering programs that bring foreign nationals to our universities and colleges, or enable American teachers and students to go abroad, should seek to strengthen the participating educational institutions.*

10. *Government programs for educational cooperation and assistance abroad will be more effective when the Government: provides funds on a long-term basis* to support the varied university activities of training and research that will enable universities to operate effectively overseas as educational institutions; *enables cooperating universities to participate at an early stage of planning* programs they are asked to carry out; *respects university autonomy* to the fullest extent compatible with the responsibilities of government for overall development programs overseas.

State governments

11. *State legislatures and executives should recognize that world affairs are of direct economic and political importance to the people of their States, and that programs in world affairs are an integral part*

of any university or college and are correspondingly eligible for and deserving of support from State funds.

Foundations

12. *Private foundations should assist the universities and colleges to achieve more adequate programs in world affairs.* Even the relatively small foundations not already doing so should give support for university activities in world affairs. In particular, foundations should make grants that enable universities and colleges to undertake *experimental and exemplary activities.* They should also use their ability to move more flexibly and promptly than government agencies in order to *pioneer educational developments* and to seize fresh opportunities not readily covered by government programs.

Private enterprise

13. *Like American education, American private business enterprise has a great and growing stake in international matters.* As do educators, business leaders also face an urgent need to strengthen their own competence to meet their new opportunities and responsibilities in world affairs. In these efforts business and universities have much in common and should explore the areas in which they can cooperate more effectively. In educating Americans to understand world forces, in training specialists, and in providing insights through research, universities perform services of high value to private business enterprise. *The responsibilities that business has acknowledged toward education in general should include, to a substantially greater extent that heretofore, planned and organized support to the universities' growing international components.*

As universities make a deliberate effort to build themselves up to meet the educational challenge presented by world affairs, they function not alone but as parts of a web of supporting and cooperating nonprofit organizations whose contributions to scholarly achievement are also vital. These are the agencies which, usually on a volunteer basis can mobilize the resources of a field as a whole or can effectively relate one university to another and universities to the Government and to other private agencies that are increasingly involved in international educational matters. *They merit support as indispensable means by which universities, scholars, and other citizens cooperate and provide leadership and services in a variety of educational tasks.*

Organizing for educational leadership

14. *Improved educational leadership and machinery for cooperation is needed both within the Government and outside the Government among the many American institutions concerned with the role of the university in world affairs.* A cooperative, rather than a centrally directed, effort is necessary for the most successful educational outcomes; it is consistent with university autonomy and the pluralism of educational interests in American society.

15. *A new private organization should be created to strengthen the educational leadership of American universities and colleges in world affairs.* It would provide a continuing mechanism for consideration of educational needs and opportunities in world affairs, facilitate the planning and appraisal of international educational programs, and promote the wise development and employment of educational resources.

In relation to the Government, the organization would provide a source of independent and authoritative advice on such matters as the development of educational institutions abroad, educational exchange, and the support of American universities in their international training and research activities. Government funds allocated for these purposes, however, would be made available directly to the educational institutions, which would accept responsibility individually or in cooperation.

The prestige of the organization would help, where such help is needed, to inspire confidence in other countries receiving U.S. governmental aid that the aid was being given for sound educational purposes. It would likewise tend to encourage the U.S. Government to relax overly close supervision of university participation in Government-supported programs.

16. *In the Federal Government, the upgrading of educational competence at all levels is indispensable and overdue.* In order to manage properly the enlarged role of the Government in this field, the attention of the Government agencies concerned needs to be focused on more effective use of university resources in program planning and implementation, and on the provision of Government support to help build university competence in world affairs. The following additional steps are urged for consideration in plans for Government organization and legislation:

In *the Department of State*, enhancement of the authority and functions of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations.

Upgrading the authority and competence of *the Office of Education* in the field of support to American higher education for world affairs activities.

Designation *by the President* of the field of higher education and world affairs as an area of special concern for one of his assistants and as an area requiring special arrangements for coordination among the Cabinet officers concerned—such as the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the head of the International Cooperation Administration or any successor agency. ("The University and World Affairs.")

FOUNDATIONS AND WORLD AFFAIRS EDUCATION

The Role of the Foundations

*by George M. Beckmann***

Mr. Beckmann is professor of history and associate dean of faculties for international programs at the University of Kansas. He served from 1961 to 1964 as program associate in the international training and research program of the Ford Foundation.

The foundations have played a decisive and continue to play a crucial role in support of the development of non-Western studies as an integral part of American higher education. Foundation grants not only have assisted universities in developing the essential resources for graduate training and for research, but have also, as a result, helped to generate a much-needed and long-overdue revolution in American education as a whole. In brief, they have improved the capacity of American universities and colleges, and consequently of society as a whole, to meet the educational challenges of a rapidly and dynamically changing world and at the same time to broaden the cultural horizons of the American people.

The foundations have provided and continue to provide the venture capital for the development of non-Western studies that the universities and colleges lacked themselves, and which the Government has been for the most part reluctant to offer. Compared with other sources of support, the record of the foundations has been impressive. Looked at with the advantage of hindsight, however, in the light of national need, the foundations started too late and let their interests develop too slowly. They are, moreover, still doing too little, and there is the danger that they will stop what they are doing too soon.

The term "foundation" as used in this article requires some explanation. There are at present approximately 15,000 foundations in the United States with capital in excess of $14 billion and a capacity to make grants totaling over $780 million a year. Most foundations are local, have small assets, and have little if any interest in higher education. With only a few exceptions, it has been the large, national, multipurpose foundations which have assisted universities and colleges to develop non-Western studies, and, of these, three have played more important roles than the others. They are the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and the Ford Foundation. This article will be limited for the most part, therefore, to an analysis of the cumulative impact of their grants on American higher education.

The role of the foundations has to be visualized not only from the standpoint of assets and funds available for grants, but also from the standpoint of the capacity to recognize and seize upon opportunities

---

*© 1964, The American Academy of Political and Social Science.

for wise and effective grant actions. Ability to act depends upon several factors. Like universities and colleges, foundations are institutions that have their own traditions, senses of purpose, and defined objectives. Similarly, the success of their program interests depends upon the competence of their leadership and of their staff. Men make foundation policies and seek to achieve their objectives. The trustees and officers of the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford Foundations have made the decisions to initiate and sustain program action in support of the development of non-Western studies in American higher education. The staffs of all three foundations have worked closely with the educational community to find the most effective ways to achieve that goal.

PIONEERING GRANTS BY ROCKEFELLER AND CARNEGIE

The Rockefeller Foundation was the first large national foundation to recognize the need to develop non-Western studies as an integral part of American higher education, and it was the only major foundation that was active in this field until after World War II. The Rockefeller Foundation pioneered support of Slavic, East Asian, Near Eastern, and Latin-American language and area studies at universities and colleges, and of scholarly activities in these areas sponsored by organizations like the American Council of Learned Societies. Its grants, however, were modest in size and totaled less than $1 million in the period from 1934 to 1942. In addition, Rockefeller fellowship programs provided funds to help train a relatively small number of young men and women in various disciplinary aspects of non-Western studies. These dollars were well invested as they helped to create the kind of competence that was so sorely needed during the period of World War II. But not enough money was invested for these purposes by American philanthropy as a whole. The demands of fighting a global war and of planning for the peace made it increasingly apparent that our society did not have adequate knowledge about many foreign areas or about the personnel and materials for training and research on them. Between 1943 and 1945, the Rockefeller Foundation, therefore, increased its support of university programs, used primarily for training and research by the military, by an amount in excess of the total of all its grants in the previous decade.

The responsibilities that accompanied the new position of power and leadership held by the United States after World War II created even greater demands for increased competence in global terms. American society desperately needed more knowledge and more trained personnel. Among the major foundations, the Rockefeller Foundation was again the first to assist a small number of scholars and their universities to expand existing or create new graduate-training and research programs in Slavic, East European, East Asian, Indian, or Near Eastern language and area studies. It set a precedent that was to be followed later by other national foundations with its grant in 1945 of $250,000 to Columbia University for the establishment of a Russian institute in the newly created School of International Affairs. The first of its kind and a model for others, the Russian institute had two basic objectives: one, to train area specialists with competence in the various aspects of Russian life and command of the Russian language, and, two, to improve American knowledge of the Soviet Union through research. In all, the Rockefeller Foundation invested another $1 million in university programs and in activities sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies in the 2-year period from 1946 to 1947 and another several million dollars in the period down to 1951.

The Carnegie Corp. was the second major foundation to provide support for the development of non-Western studies. In 1947, after several years of planning, it made a series of relatively modest 5-year grants to a dozen or so universities in support of area institutes for graduate training and research on Japan, India, the Near East, southeast Asia, and Latin America. The largest grant was for $155,000, and the smallest, for $56,000. A year later, the Carnegie Corp. made two grants that had an especially important impact upon the whole effort to develop non-Western language and area studies programs. One was a grant of $740,000, a sum which was unprecedented, to the newly established Russian Research Center at Harvard for study of all phases of Russian life through utilization of all the available tools of the social sciences. The second was a grant of $130,000, subsequently renewed, to the Social Science Research Council for a program of national fellowships for graduate-level training in foreign area studies. In all, the Carnegie Corp. made grants in support of non-Western studies totaling some $2.5 million in the period from 1947 to 1951.

The Rockefeller Foundation and Carnegie Corp. grants, while not generally large, brought handsome returns. First, they helped universities to establish or strengthen non-Western language and area studies programs at a time when university finances and facilities were strained under pressures both old and new. This was important because these grants not only helped to expand non-Western studies in the disciplines and to establish a firm base for languge instruction, but also assisted a new approach to graduate training and research to obtain a secure foothold in the academic community. The concept and practice of combining discipline and area studies training was accepted more rapidly as a result. Second, the grants helped to increase the number of young men and women competent in non-Western areas. For example, the foreign area training fellowship program administered by the Social Science Research Council made more than 200 awards between 1947 and 1953.

LARGE-SCALE SUPPORT BY FORD

The Ford Foundation, shortly after its reorganization as a national philanthropy in 1951, recognized the need to improve the capabilities of the United States in meeting its responsibilities in world affairs—especially for maintaining the strength of the non-Communist nations and for assisting the social and economic development of the emerging countries. Its international training and research program therefore followed the lead of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corp. in spending part of its substantial resources—vast when compared to other foundations—to assist American higher education to equip itself with the men, knowledge, and organization necessary to respond more effectively to the demands upon it.

Since 1952 the Ford Foundation has allocated $138 million for grants designed to improve American competence to deal with international problems by narrowing the gap between the needs for and the supply of trained personnel and knowledge. Approximately half of that total has been used to strengthen non-Western language and area studies in American universities and colleges. Over the same period, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corp. expended for the same purpose approximately $5 million and $4 million, respectively. Recently, however, the latter two foundations have begun to change their roles. The Rockefeller Foundation has increasingly moved away from supporting American institutions of higher education in world affairs and has followed the path of developmental assistance to selected universities in the underdeveloped countries. The Carnegie Corp. continues its active interest in American higher education and world affairs, but, with its relatively smaller funds, plays more of an innovating role.

Graduate training and research programs

The bulk of the Ford funds have been used to improve and consolidate existing language and area training and research programs in the major universities and to establish new programs where they were needed. In the case of existing programs, this permitted an expansion of graduate training and research. It also made possible a change in the very character of area studies through the addition of new staff in the social sciences. This was important because it gave language and area studies programs a broader disciplinary base, one which could give more attention to modern and contemporary problems. In the case of hitherto neglected areas, there was an expansion of language and area studies programs on southeast Asia and Africa. In all, by 1959, some 21 language and area studies programs were receiving foundation support.

During the past 5 years, an important change has occurred in the pattern of Ford Foundation grants to universities in support of non-Western language and area studies programs. With the growth of institutional competence there was a shift from short- or medium-term grants, originally given to support specific graduate training and research programs, to broader, long-term—usually for 10 years—assistance to *universitywide* efforts to develop non-Western language and area programs, as well as other international studies. Through long-term grants for the Ford Foundation has sought to encourage the country's major university centers to take an institutionwide approach to their international interests and to incorporate non-Western language and area studies as permanent features. From 1959 to 1963 it made grants to 15 universities, divided almost equally between private and State institutions, in an amount totaling $42 million. It designated $26 million of that total for support of non-Western language and area studies to include provision for faculty and library-staff salaries, expansion of library holdings for reseach, individual, or group research projects, and graduate-student fellowships. The 15 universities are as follows: Columbia, Harvard, Chicago, California, Cornell, Michigan, Washington, Princeton, Yale, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Northwestern, Stanford, and Boston. They have led the way in the development of non-Western language and area studies and, in most cases, have substantial other international interests. They have a large number of the country's most distinguished scholars, libraries with strong research collections, and imaginative and effective instructional programs. In summary, through this single-grant approach, the Ford Foundation is supporting some 44 non-Western language and area studies programs for graduate training and research as follows: East Asian, 12; Slavic or East European, 10; south or southeast Asian, 8; Near Eastern, 7; and African, 7. And it also is providing very limited developmental support to stimulate interest in Latin-American studies at six of the above universities.

The Ford Foundation is not limiting its support to non-Western language and area studies programs to grants to these 15 universities. On the contrary, it recognizes that, viewed in terms of national need, the collective resources of the 15 universities account for only a small fraction of the country's student population, faculty interests and competences, overseas programs, and visiting foreign students and scholars. The Ford Foundation is seeking, therefore, to encourage additional private, State, and land-grant universities to enlarge and consolidate their resources for graduate training, research, and developmental activities in the international field. To date, it has made grants, usually for a 5-year period, totaling approximately $6 million, to the following universities: Oregon, Washington at St. Louis, Kansas, Syracuse, Illinois, Pittsburgh, and Michigan State. Each of these grants includes support of non-Western language and area studies programs for graduate training and research.

Foreign area fellowship programs

The foundations provided support for the training of individuals, as well as the development of university language and area programs, because personnel continued to be inadequate in view of the needs of American society as a whole and of higher education more specifically. The continued expansion of existing university programs, for example, depended upon increasing the supply of first-rate, well-trained young scholars. The creation of new faculty positions in discipline departments at other institutions and the establishment of new language and area programs at some of them were similarly dependent upon the availability of competent personnel. Talent had to be recruited systematically and trained over a period sufficiently long to guarantee linguistic and research competence. The Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corp. had begun to attack this problem in the 1930's and 1940's through limited support of fellowship programs. The problem was so great in the decade of the 1950's that a crash effort was needed, and among the foundations only Ford had the resources for such an approach.

The foreign area fellowship program, funded by the Ford Foundation since its inception in 1952, has made and continues to make the single most effective contribution to solution of the problem of the shortage of first-rate, well-trained personnel. It was administered directly by the Ford Foundation from 1952 to 1962 and since that time by a joint committee of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. Over the past 12 years, the fellowship program has awarded a total of approximately $10 million in grants to 1,214 individuals, of whom some 984 have completed periods of training averaging from 2 to 3 years in length. The bulk of the grants have gone to advanced graduate students and young scholars in the training stages of their careers rather than to established scholars.

Their training programs have in most cases combined the regular requirements of a discipline or professional field, intensive language study, and a multidisciplinary approach to a foreign culture, and have often included field language-training and research for the doctoral dissertation. At first, fellowships were offered only for the study of Asia and the Near East; however, in 1954 the program was enlarged to include the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and Africa. Later, in 1961, fellowships were offered for Latin-American studies, and in 1964, for West European studies. The breakdown of the area concentrations of the fellows is as follows: East Asia, 237; the Near East, 148; south Asia, 141; southeast Asia, 105; the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, 348; Africa, 171; Latin America, 37; and international relations, 27.

A few more statistics will demonstrate just how successful this program has been in strengthening American higher education. Of the 984 former fellows, 550 hold faculty positions in 191 colleges and universities in 38 States. This has had two important results, one of which is clearly indicated by the figures and a second which is not. The fellowship program has helped to provide personnel for colleges and universities which have become interested in non-Western studies. Young men and women have joined their faculties largely as historians, political scientists, anthropologists, and economists and to a lesser extent as teachers of critical languages and literatures, sociologists, and geographers. They have enabled discipline departments to expand their course offerings, and some of them have provided the necessary leadership for the establishment of new language and area programs. Yet, at the same time, there has been some concentration of former fellows at universities, thereby adding strength to existing programs while providing a broader base for new ones. Some 29 universities have employed 5 or more fellows, and 10 universities have employed 10 or more. In addition to academic and teaching careers, 82 former fellows are now in Government service, 38 have joined philanthropic or nonprofit organizations, and 45 are in business or the professions. Many former fellows have added to our knowledge of the non-Western world through the publication of the results of research. Altogether they have published some 373 books and over 3,000 articles and short monographs; moreover, they have edited or contributed to another 516 volumes.

Individual and group research projects

The foundations have also been the major source of support of research projects conceived by individual scholars, especially those at institutions where there is no foundation-supported program, or by groups of scholars with common or complementary interests that require large-scale funding.

In the case of the individual scholar, grants have sometimes been made directly to the researcher by the foundation, but more often they have been made through existing academic or scholarly channels, such as the various committees of the American Council of Learned Societies or the Social Science Research Council. For example, five committees—on Africa, contemporary China, Latin America, the Near East, and comparative politics—of the Social Science Research Council made grants to over 300 scholars in the period from 1955 to 1964.

And the Asian Committee and the Slavic and East European Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies have made grants to another 300 scholars over much the same period. Another foundation-supported program which deserves particular mention in this context is the study and research program in the Soviet Union under the auspices of an interuniversity committee, which now has a membership of 38 American universities. By 1964 well over 200 American scholars had participated in it. Although group projects tend to get more publicity, the foundations have not ignored the individual scholar. And in many cases, group projects have been nothing more than the coordination of the common interests of individual scholars.

The following examples of grants to group projects will give some idea of the variety of kinds of projects and approaches to knowledge that have been supported by the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford Foundations: $420,000 to Columbia University for research on the political evolution of modern China (1955), $277,000 to Harvard University for research on the economy of China in modern times (1955), $200,000 to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for a study of economic development and social change in sub-Saharan Africa (1959), $200,000 to the University of Michigan for research on the political modernization of Japan (1961), $130,000 to the University of Florida for studies of the historical and contemporary forces shaping the territories and nations of [illegible] Caribbean (1961), $910,000 to the Social Science Research Council for research on the economy of Communist China (1961), $240,000 to the University of Chicago for research on education and socioeconomic development of transitional societies (1962), and $250,000 to Northwestern University for research on intercultural-relations (1962).

The foundation approach in support of research has also included grants to foreign scholars and institutions in order to broaden the base of our knowledge of areas and cultures of the non-Western World. For example, the foundations have assisted research carried on by scholars associated with Toyo Bunko in Tokyo, the Academia Sinica on Taiwan, and the Asiatic Research Center of Korea University in Seoul. And they have made possible fruitful collaboration between American and indigenous foreign scholars, especially in the case of Japanese and Indian studies.

Undergraduate education

The foundations have played a crucial role in encouraging and assisting liberal arts colleges, either independent or in universities, to make basic changes in their approach to liberal learning through the integration of an international dimension, especially non-Western studies. The Carnegie Corporation led the way in the late 1940's and 1950's with a relatively small number of experimental grants to Columbia, Chicago, Michigan, and eight other universities and colleges for the development of new general education courses on non-Western areas. And since 1959 the Ford Foundation has made grants, totaling about $6 million, to help approximately 100 colleges make non-Western studies a permanent part of undergraduate education. In order to maximize impact, the Ford Foundation has made grants for the most part to support various kinds of cooperative approaches to the development of adequate teaching resources involving groups of liberal arts colleges.

Space limitations permit only a brief listing of the variety of foundation efforts which have helped to implant non-Western studies in undergraduate education. They include the much enlarged reservoir of scholarly personnel now teaching undergraduates in well over several hundred colleges and universities; curricular planning and experimentation; the substantial materials which have been prepared for use in general education courses; the addition of a non-Western area dimension to the competence of existing college faculty members, either through special advanced study programs at major university foreign-area centers or through on-campus faculty seminars and other similar means; and the expansion of library holdings for teaching purposes, following such specialized guidelines as the select bibliography on Asia, Africa, Russia and Eastern Europe, and Latin America prepared by the American universities field staff.

CONCLUSION

The demands upon the United States arising out of its involvement in world affairs show no signs of lessening in the decade ahead. If anything, a greater effort will be required to produce the personnel, knowledge, and understanding required for the tasks at hand and in prospect. One important task for American higher education is to build a broader base of competence on non-Western areas in order to expand the capacity for teaching, research, and service in the international realm.

In response to this challenge many American universities and colleges are currently undergoing a revolutionary transformation in adding a new international dimension to their activities and integrating it with their educational programs. They are endeavoring to reconceive their international roles, to innovate in their programs and organization, and to establish new relationships with one another, the government, and overseas institutions. Two recent reports have focused upon this important advance—*The University and World Affairs* and *The College and World Affairs*.[1]

This kind of development in American higher education requires not only leadership from within but also financial and other support from various sectors of society. The Federal Government, entering upon fields pioneered earlier by the foundations, is a potential source of massive support. So far it has played a limited but expanding role in supporting certain language and area activities of American universities through the NDEA, in using universities in development programs through the Agency for International Development (AID), and in strengthening educational institutions in the United States and overseas through the State Department exchange programs. State governments are only now beginning to recognize that their own vital interests are served by great State universities which help to meet needs in the field of world affairs, with which the individual States, as well as the Nation, are profoundly and directly concerned. Foundations, business, and other private agencies continue to provide the indispensable support without which the American higher educational establishment would lose its characteristic pluralism, flexibility, and freedom in responding to new social demands with new scholarly approaches and new educational programs.

---

[1] *The University and World Affairs* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1960); *The College and World Affairs* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964).

It is essential that those foundations already devoting part of their resources to broadening the basis of international competence throughout American higher education continue to assist selected training and research programs on non-Western areas. It is equally important that they support the full range of the international activities. It is also necessary that other national foundations, and, even more important, local foundations allocate some of their resources for these purposes.

More specifically, foundation resources will be required to help achieve the following:

(1) *Personnel.*—Because of the increased pressures and complexity of international events and the increased awareness of the existing and potential roles of the universities and colleges, the gap in American competence cannot be said to have been closed, despite the resource development that has taken place. There must be an increase in the number of persons with non-Western area competence. To this end, programs like the graduate-level Ford-supported foreign area fellowship program must be continued if not expanded. There is need, moreover, for more postdoctoral fellowship opportunities, especially for training on Africa and Latin America, and for more imaginative approaches to the training of a select number of able and committed undergraduates.

(2) *Research.*—Continued and expanded support of individual and group research projects by the foundations is essential in order to keep abreast of all kinds of demands for new knowledge. There will be increasing need for studies on problems relating to the process of development, or concerned with intercultural relations, which can build upon area and social science knowledge already obtained. But these studies should not be supported at the expense of basic research on specific non-Western countries and areas. Foundation support of research must not be confined to projects geared only to problem solving or to increasing knowledge of contemporary society. The recently published *Report of The Commission on the Humanities* in suggesting a reordering of foundation priorities noted as follows:

> Everyone knows it is easy to persuade the board to give $950,000 to young economists working over the meager data on China's present economy, difficult to get $120,000 for a 7-year project in the humanities (here premodern history) involving all the senior Chinese scholars in the country.[2]

There is much in recent foundation policy and actions to warrant such a complaint.

(3) *Graduate training and research centers.*—The foundations must persist in their support of existing graduate language and area programs until they are accepted as a permanent and normal part of a university's total educational effort. The universities on their part must reciprocate by showing greater evidence of their commitment. And there is more that the foundations can do. The present development of language and area centers provides uneven coverage of the important non-Western countries and regions, and in some cases there is scarcely any systematic coverage at all. For example, it is essential

---

[2] *Report of The Commission on the Humanities* (New York: American Council of Learned Societies. 1964). p. 86.

that the United States have at least one first-rate training program and research center on Korea, the Philippines, and Vietnam and that there be an effective division of labor in African and Latin-American studies. It is especially important that the foundations make a vigorous effort to help support a long-overdue expansion of Latin-American studies. Latin-American studies were among the earliest of area studies programs to be established. There are at present Latin-American course offerings at more than 30 American universities, but in none of them is to be found the quality of scholarship which has become increasingly common among non-Western area studies centers. The country needs a minimum of 10 to 12 major graduate training and research centers, each with at least one very strong disciplinary base in addition to multidisciplinary resources. It is hoped that the current program of the Ford Foundation to improve Latin-American competence will be the harbinger of similar activity by other foundations. And finally it is essential that foundations help to encourage and assist the development of closer relationships and more effective collaboration between the academic social sciences and those professions or applied social sciences most heavily involved in overseas developmental activities in Africa, the Near East, Latin America, and south and southeast Asia.

(4) *Interinstitutional cooperation to develop and share scarce resources.*—Foundations should help stimulate joint planning by universities and assist them to develop joint programs along the lines of the intensive summer Chinese- and Japanese-language program of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation or the Interuniversity Language Centers in Tokyo and Taipeh. Foundations should also encourage and assist cooperative programs between universities and colleges as in the case of the Indiana statewide non-Western studies program or the cooperative critical languages program involving Princeton and over 50 liberal arts colleges. Foundations also have a special responsibility for encouraging American universities to increase and regularize their contacts with training and research institutions in their geographic areas of interest. This can be done through faculty exchange and through arrangements for collaboration with scholars in the foreign area on research projects. Although there are recognized difficulties in such ventures, the prospective results over the long run are so promising that foundations not only should seize upon opportunities as they appear but also should not draw back from making their institutional support grants conditional on them.

(5) *Undergraduate education.*—A substantial number of colleges are developing a clear and unequivocal institutional commitment to include non-Western studies, not as an extra, but rather as an integral part of their educational programs. Many want to experiment with new curricular approaches. The central problem for them will be teaching resources. They will need assistance especially to strengthen faculty competence. They will also need to make limited resources go farther by cooperating when feasible with other institutions—sharing faculty and library resources, developing programs, such as overseas study, jointly, and working out a division of labor in non-Western language and area studies—and by taking advantage of the experience and resources of nearby universities. Foundation grants should continue to seek to stimulate and assist various kinds of cooperative ap-

proaches to faculty development and curricular revision by groups of colleges; cooperation between universities and colleges, especially in mobilizing scarce resources for non-Western language and area studies; faculty development and curricular experimentation at, at least, a select number of colleges; and the preparation of teaching materials.

Clearly then, the contribution of the foundations to the development of non-Western studies in universities and colleges has been impressive. Yet, despite remarkable progress in the creation of new resources, the gap is widening instead of narrowing between the demands of American society for more well-trained personnel and new kinds of knowledge and the capacity of American higher education to supply them. The challenge to the foundations, national as well as local, is greater today than ever before. ("The Role of the Foundations," The *Annals* of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1964.)

INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM

LIBERAL LEARNING IN A CHANGING WORLD

Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs

by Percy W. Bidwell *

For a number of years Mr. Bidwell was director of studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, after having taught at Yale, the University of Buffalo, and Columbia University. After leaving the council he made a 3-year study, sponsored by the Carnegie Corp. of New York, of undergraduate education in foreign affairs in U.S. colleges and universities, a study which was published in book form in 1962.

Today, as never before, the American people are participating, indirectly but nevertheless importantly, in the making of foreign policy. They cannot initiate policy but they may, in effect, through expressions of disapproval, veto proposed new measures or cause established policies to be modified or abandoned. Yet great numbers of voters lack the knowledge and understanding of foreign countries and international relations, which are essential to intelligent, responsible judgments. This grave weakness in our democracy challenges American education at all levels, from the elementary grades to the universities.

President, then Senator, Kennedy once remarked, "I do not know whether the Battle of Waterloo was actually won on the playing fields of Eton. But it is no exaggeration to say that the struggle in which we are now engaged may well be won or lost in the classrooms of America." In this study, we are concerned with what typical undergraduates are learning, or failing to learn, about foreign affairs in the classrooms of American colleges and universities. In their future careers, they will have little use for specialized knowledge of international relations. As American citizens, however, they will participate in making foreign policy. Periodically, in voting for a President, a Senator, or a Congressman, they, in effect, will be supporting the type of foreign policy for which the candidate stands. Moreover, their civic responsibility will not be discharged merely on election days. In every American community, college graduates form the group that supplies community leaders. On all questions of public affairs, including foreign affairs, their opinions carry weight with their friends and acquaintances. The wider their knowledge of the

---

*© 1962, Columbia University Press.

international scene, the higher is the probability that their judgments will be sound.

A liberal education is rated high by students, their parents, and their instructors among the benefits to be obtained from "going to college." But a liberal education is incomplete without something more than a passing acquaintance with the world outside the United States. For the college graduate's full enjoyment of his physical and cultural environment, for the satisfaction of his intellectual curiosity, and for the full development of his mental capacities, he needs knowledge and understanding of foreign countries. He ought to be acquainted with the distinctive features of their topography, their climate, their natural resources, and their principal industries. He needs to be informed about the operation of their political institutions. He needs to recognize and appreciate their cultural achievements.

College graduates of this generation who least expect it may eventually find themselves at work abroad. For there is a growing demand in staffing our multifarious foreign operations for "amateurs," well-educated men and women distinguished more for their good judgment, their intelligence, and their integrity than for expertise in foreign affairs. Yet the run-of-the-mine college graduate is ill-prepared for this type of work in either public or private employment. In language skills, he is particularly deficient. Only a few recent graduates can correctly translate into English simple prose written in a foreign language; even fewer can speak or understand it when it is spoken. Many are deficient in "cultural empathy." They are unable rapidly to acquire an understanding and an appreciation of a foreign civilization or feel at ease in a foreign environment.

John Dewey, it has been said, "* * * directed his revolt not against tradition, but against a rather recent development—the gap created by the inability of Americans to adjust their conceptions of education and culture to the terms of the changing world about them." The opinion is widespread that in the field of foreign affairs American colleges, in general, have not done a good job for the common run of undergraduate, either in preparing him for his civic responsibilities, or for possible service abroad, or in equipping him with the knowledge and understanding of foreign countries which are the hallmarks of a liberal education. Higher education in the United States, we are told on good authority, is more provincial than that of any comparable country. Seniors emerge from our colleges and universities with little more acquaintance with foreign affairs than when they entered as freshmen. Well-informed observers have stated that American colleges and universities do not "produce graduates who are adequately informed, interested, realistic, sensitive, and responsible so far as events and conditions outside the United States are concerned."

As a rough measure of what the typical college senior knows about foreign affairs a test was given in May-June 1960 to some 2,000 seniors selected at random at 36 colleges and universities across the country. The questions were designed to test students' knowledge and understanding of significant facts in the history, geography, and political institutions of foreign countries, and American policy and international relations. The omission of questions in the fields of sociology and anthropology was not owing to failure to recognize their significance in international relations but rather because of the practical need of restricting the scope of the examination.

The test * * * was prepared by the Educational Testing Service on the basis of suggestions from over 100 persons with experience in foreign affairs and public affairs in general. * * * In the author's opinion [the] scores confirm the general statements quoted above regarding the typical undergraduate's ignorance of foreign affairs. The test also revealed interesting differences among students in various curriculums, types of institutions, and geographical regions.

The average undergraduate's lack of knowledge of foreign affairs, as revealed by the test on foreign affairs, is symptomatic of a more general and widespread weakness in American higher education. A similar test in other fields—in chemistry, physics, mathematics, literature, or philosophy—would also disclose disturbing deficiencies. These deficiencies, particularly in the natural sciences, have been recognized and are now receiving attention. But ignorance of foreign affairs, on the part of several hundred thousand young men and women who each year join the ranks of so-called educated citizens, a dangerous deficiency in the present crisis in American foreign relations, has received hardly any attention and practically no remedial action.

A senior's lack of knowledge of foreign affairs should not be ascribed solely to defects in his college education. He may have come from a home, and a community, whose members were concerned exclusively with local and domestic matters. His elementary and secondary schools may have failed to give him an adequate preparation in history, geography, and modern languages. Thus, he may have entered college with little knowledge of countries outside the United States and little curiosity about them.

During his 4 years at college, he will not lack opportunities to outgrow these deficiencies. College curriculums display an abundance of specialized courses dealing with international relations, American foreign policy, and the history of foreign countries—their political and economic institutions and their social and cultural life. It is true that these courses refer principally to the countries of Western Europe, but this deficiency is now being rapidly repaired by the addition of new courses on the so-called non-Western areas, the Far East, Africa, Latin America, the U.S.S.R., and Eastern Europe.

But specialized courses which are concerned with foreign countries and international relations enroll only a small fraction of the total undergraduate body. Few of them are required for the bachelor's degree; they are not popular as electives since to most students they appear to have no vocational value.

Major traffic points in the undergraduate curriculum are the introductory courses in history, government, economics, sociology, and anthropology. These general education courses * * * concentrate their attention on the American scene, neglecting valuable opportunities to deepen the students' understanding of American institutions by comparison and contrast with those of foreign countries.

Largely on account of graduation requirements, students flock in large numbers to beginning courses in English literature and modern languages. In most colleges these courses fail to contribute as much as they might to students' understanding of contemporary social life and the cultural achievements of Britain, France, Germany, and other

Western European countries. Few students engage in the study of non-Western languages and literatures.

In general, the chances are rather small that the run-of-the-mine undergraduate will become better acquainted, *in formal courses*, with the history, the politics, or the social and cultural life of foreign countries. As a freshman or sophomore, prerequisite requirements and other college regulations, plus his own lack of interest, prevent his taking the specialized courses which would afford this sort of knowledge, and in these years, his general education courses fail to supply it. In his junior and senior years, he will be too much absorbed in preparing for a career in business, teaching, engineering, or some other profession to choose electives in fields remote from his vocational interests.

In this rather dim picture, a few bright spots appear. In some universities, freshmen and sophomores are being taught American history as a part of world history. One can find courses in introductory sociology which are designed to reveal to the students what is general or universal in human society, so that through contrasts with foreign institutions they may gain insight into those of their own country. Some teachers of introductory government courses are devoting substantial attention to American foreign policy and international relations. In elementary economics, new courses built around the concept of economic development introduce the student immediately to problems of foreign trade and investment. International relations, a subject previously reserved for upperclassmen most of whom were intending to specialize in foreign affairs, now in an increasing number of colleges is taught to freshmen and sophomores, as part of their general education. Teachers of English literature and world literature are recognizing that their introductory courses may serve as gateways to understanding foreign cultures. Along with the postwar revival in the study of French, German, and Spanish have come revolutionary changes in the methods and the goals of instruction in modern languages. Significant innovations in this field have enlarged the undergraduates' knowledge of foreign countries, particularly those of Western Europe.

These are advances in the right direction, but in most colleges and universities they have not gone far enough. * * *

Why do so many specialized courses in the history, the geography, the economic and social institutions of foreign countries attract so few students?

Is it possible to revise the content of general education courses, making them more effective in providing knowledge and understanding of foreign countries and at the same time deepening students' understanding and appreciation of the history and the institutions of their own country?

The information about foreign countries and the problems of international relations which students derive from general education courses, even after revision, will usually be fragmentary and disjointed. How can scattered facts and flashes of understanding be coordinated and interrelated? Can this best be accomplished by requiring all undergraduates to take a course in international relations, or in world issues, or American foreign policy? Or must each student integrate his own knowledge of the international scene?

What importance should be attached to extracurricular activities, such as lectures by visiting foreign diplomats and State Department experts? What educational value for foreign affairs have exhibitions of the work of foreign artists, concerts by distinguished musicians from abroad, undergraduate programs of foreign travel and study?

Can extracurricular activities be effective in stimulating student interest in foreign affairs, in creating a new climate of campus opinion, in supplementing work in formal courses?

What would be the most effective means of mobilizing and coordinating a university's varied and scattered resources, curricular and extracurricular, in all schools and divisions, for undergraduate education in foreign affairs? (*Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs.*)

The College and World Affairs

A Report of the Committee on the College and World Affairs

During 1962 and 1963 an autonomous committee, brought together and financed by a grant from the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, considered the complexities of a swiftly changing world and their meaning for liberal education. Chairman of the committee was John W. Nason, president of Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.; George M. Beckmann, of the University of Kansas, served as study director. The committee's report, intended to supplement the Morrill Committee report, The University and World Affairs, was published in 1964 under the title of "The College and World Affairs."

The change that has swept the world in our century has altered the lives of nearly every person in it, or will soon do so. Unfortunately, it has not yet produced anywhere in corresponding magnitude the necessary adaptations in education. There has come into being a fateful lag between the circumstances of life in which men and women must live and their inner preparation to do so wisely and effectively.

The most painful consequences of that lag may lie in store for the United States, whose 190 million people have been thrust by events into the vortex of world affairs. So great are the changes in perspective and the increases in knowledge required of us, that new approaches to learning are essential at every level from the elementary school to the continuing education of adults.

A NEW STRATEGY OF LIBERAL LEARNING

We regard an intelligent understanding of our changing world as the basic ingredient of liberal learning today. We do not regard liberal learning as the exclusive possession of formal education, let alone of the liberal arts college. On the contrary, it holds a central place within the wide range of institutions which offer advanced education to the great majority of our youth. Although we tend to take for granted the meaning of liberal education, the need to restate its purposes and methods has never been greater. At the same time, the task of prying the essence of liberal learning out of academic verbiage and junglelike curriculur growth has never been more difficult. The central aim of liberal learning is to free and enlarge the mind and spirit of man. It helps the individual to break through the crust of preconception and customary inhibition in which he may have been reared, to choose in freedom his values and goals, to liberate himself from the meanness and meagerness of mere existence. It enables him to rediscover in himself a nobler and larger aspect, a process to which George Washington referred when he used the epithet "liberal" as the ultimate compliment for his finest officers. As perhaps its greatest gift, liberal education bestows upon a person the "power to multiply and explore choices so that the world ceases to be a little place trimmed to the dimensions of one's private experience. . . ." [1]

The basic philosophy of liberal education thus provides the point of departure for new strategies of learning indispensable in today's world. It expands a man's horizons by freeing his intellect. It removes the blinders of parochialism and leads the emancipated person toward an affinity for all that is human. In doing this, it forces him to look deeply into his own society, to see it whole, and to see it in relation to all of human endeavor. Viewed thus, liberal learning is a dynamic that animates the intellectual community in its entirety. It is not something that a man can inherit or accept passively as the gift of a free society. It is a creative and sometimes painful process that must take place within the individual. It is continuously and actively liberating. It endures because those whom it has enlightened and inspired arouse these qualities anew in each succeeding generation.

To state the purposes of liberal education thus is to indicate what can be and what should be rather than what is. The actual state of liberal learning has too often fallen far short of these enlightening aims. Its central purposes have been lost sight of under the impact of unsympathetic philosophies and religions, or certain economic and political forces. They have suffered attrition during periods of deep schism in educational or political principle. Beyond this, many colleges and universities that profess liberality in education have made difficult the attainment of its purposes by emasculating or cheapening the curriculum, or by permitting the course structure and the college community itself to become weedy with modes of living and learning antithetical to liberality of mind and spirit.

When the purposes and processes of liberal learning are reassessed in terms of the changing world, the need for new concepts and a new emphasis becomes self-evident. If liberal education is to meet the requirements of a new kind of world, it must undergo one of those fundamental overhauls that have kept it alive for centuries. There is need for more than adding a course here and there, more than repackaging of old courses. There must be a reformulation of purpose. The great humanistic philosophy in liberal learning must be translated into 20th-century terms.

THE CHANGING WORLD

The changes that liberal learning must encompass touch every aspect of man's activity and have occurred in every geographic region of the globe. They are revolutionary in scope and have transformed the world in the past half century. Technological innovation has spread into areas that have, until recently, known only limited technical growth. Improved roads and airstrips link towns and villages and metropolitan centers. Jet planes reach the most remote capitals in less than 48 hours. Communication with any part of the world requires only minutes, or at most hours.

A wave of modernization has swept through societies that previously had clung to ancient or primitive ways. Their economic capacities have been improved. The aspirations of peoples at all levels of economic development have been raised. New social and political patterns have arisen within nations. Some new states, as well as old ones, have moved toward liberal and democratic political systems. Some, caught up in the revolution that has spread from the Soviet Union since 1945, have Communist regimes. Others are in the throes of the struggle between Communist and anti-Communist forces. New world configurations have taken form in trade, in the movement of ideas and persons, in ideological affinities, in the distribution of power, and in the expression of political will.

---

[1] Van Doren, Mark, *Liberal Education* (New York, 1943), p .66.

Three major historical thrusts have been selected to demonstrate the new dimensions and strategies of learning that will be required within our educational system. They are (1) the shift in relationships that has moved the United States, along with very few other nations, into the center of world affairs, (2) the emergence of new nations and the vast increase in the world importance of their cultures, and (3) the new complexities as well as the new opportunities that have been introduced into the process of interaction among cultures and nation-states by the growing participation of people as well as officials in this process.

The new role of the United States

It would be difficult to overestimate the far-reaching implications of the shift in the locus of world power and responsibility that has thrust the United States into the thinly populated center of world affairs. It is a change that has brought within the grasp of this Nation, for better or for worse, the capacity to influence decisively our own future and that of humanity.

It is trite to observe, two decades after the beginnings of this shift, that both power and responsibility came to the United States before either the Government or the people were prepared for it. They had neither the knowledge, the outlook, the skills, nor the understanding required. Unfortunately, this condition still persists even after 20 years. It is this continuing lack of preparation for world leadership that poses a serious challenge to education.

This lack of preparation exists in part because the world has become infinitely more complex in recent years, requiring higher levels of understanding. It exists in part because the American people have been shielded from the raw impact of world affairs by generally high levels of national prosperity, and have been preoccupied with developments inside the Nation. And it exists in part because the people of this Nation, although growing in their capacity to respond to world tensions with a greater measure of wisdom and patience, have not yet perceived clearly the great forces of change that lie beneath those tensions. With their traditional concern about domestic problems, neither the people nor all elements of their Government have fully discerned how intricately intertwined are domestic affairs and world affairs. Nor have they learned how to use the complicated and sometimes cumbersome mechanism of democracy in such a manner that it will serve efficiently both American national needs and the needs of the rest of the world.

This situation imposes unmistakable obligations upon liberal learning in the United States. A liberal education must be the means for bringing into balance an intelligent understanding of forces at work both inside and outside the Nation. An adequate understanding of the

United States must include insight into both the structure and function of its society and Government. There must be an intelligent appreciation of this Nation in its current and historical manifestations. The relationship of its culture to other cultures must be perceived, as well as the changing place of the United States in the world. Attention must be given to the intricate processes by which the Nation reaches its decisions and asserts its leadership both at home and abroad. Domestic change must be viewed in a world dimension and world change in its domestic implications. This new approach to liberal education must produce a generation of young Americans equipped to discharge with wisdom the grave responsibilities that rest upon their country.

The emergence of new nations and cultures

The upsurge of new nations and the consequent increasing world importance of their cultures places a special obligation upon liberal learning.

National independence in recent years has been coupled with high aspirations for international status, economic advancement, and better education. It has included also a justifiable pride in indigenous languages and cultures. The newly independent peoples wish these respected and understood by other nations, no matter how many cultural importations from Europe and the United States they may choose to adopt.

A liberal education must impart an understanding of both new states and old states that have achieved new world status. To accomplish this, a new strategy must be devised to divest learning of its present provincialism, or more properly of its historical and current preoccupation with the heritage of Western civilization. The new strategy must extend liberal learning to include the great teachings of other world cultures and thus fulfill its purpose of embracing life in all its diverse human forms. It must lead the student to understand these cultures in the same manner as he does those of the West—as growing and dynamic, with a past, a present, and a future.

The change is coming slowly. Before 1945 it would have been difficult to find programs of liberal education in undergraduate colleges that had escaped from the historical confines of Western culture. Individual courses were available in some colleges. Language training programs were introduced into some universities after 1941 as the United States responded to a war of world dimensions. There was little change, however, in the general concept of the liberal arts. As late as 1943 Mark Van Doren could write a book on liberal education that neither took into consideration its application to cultures other than those of the West, nor sought new meanings in those cultures. Alfred North Whitehead also confined himself to the traditional West when he wrote on education in 1929 (although he did mention Chinese as a language preferred for study), even as he discussed in the same volume the educational implications of "Space, Time, and Relativity."

The cultures that have been neglected are those of the Asian and African countries, of Russia and of Latin America. The culture of Russia draws, of course, upon the cultures of both Europe and Asia. The historical blending of Orient and Occident in Russia has been overlaid by still a third culture, that of communism. The cultures of Latin America have strong roots in the Western heritage. They need to be better understood because, despite their European roots, they have a content and style different from those of North America and Europe. The Western heritage in Latin America has been modified in varying degree by contact with indigenous cultures.

All of these cultures have been subjected to profound study by experts in the United States and Europe, but only very recently have they aroused popular interest. It took the rise of new nations from the ashes of colonialism after the Second World War to focus attention upon the importance of cultures other than those of the West. Almost overnight the cultures of Asia and Africa, and in succeeding years, those of Latin America, began to assume a new significance. For the first time, the United States began to acknowledge the intrinsic importance of cultures beyond the Western periphery and to speak, at first softly, of the "provincialism" of its undergraduate education.

Realizing that a wide public understanding of foreign cultures was now essential, educational critics turned to the schools, colleges, and universities and found them wanting. The undergraduate curriculum of higher education had not kept pace with the new dimensions of world involvement. Liberal learning, conceived in the civilization of the West, remained parochial. As the new need became apparent a few undergraduate programs were modified. They drew stimulation from events and from the graduate programs of the universities. Too few institutions, however, in the 19 years since the war ended, have taken vigorous action to educate our youth to meet the requirements of a changing world. We have perceived the need for a new strategy of liberal learning but, as a nation, we have realized it only in small measure. Today the need has acquired a note of urgency.

The Process of Interaction

The undergraduate, in the course of acquiring a liberal education, must achieve yet another dimension of understanding. In addition to a deeper perception of his own society and its world role, in addition to a comprehension of cultures within and beyond the West, he must achieve insight into the continuous process of interaction among peoples and cultures. Continual interaction, accelerated by the changes of the past half century, is the context within which both states and individuals must live and conduct their affairs. It is an intricately tangled network of social, economic, and political forces acting and reacting upon one another, both within the borders of states and among states. This complicated process can be understood only when it is perceived as having roots deep within each of the cultures involved.

Interaction is of many kinds and on every scale. It may consist of the simple cross-cultural contacts of two human beings. It may involve organized private ventures of economic or social character. It involves the continuous interchange of thought and knowledge. Only when this is understood, is it possible to discern undercurrents of meaning in the formal conduct of political relationships among states. Together the many different kinds of levels of sociocultural interaction form a powerful and turbulent stream. Liberal education must make it possible for young men and women to understand and occasionally to withstand the powerful currents which make up that stream, with intellectual certitude, with poise and with a clear sense of the direction in which they are moving.

There has been a striking popularization of relationships among peoples and states in the past 50 years. Although the process of interaction has never been wholly the business of governments and technical experts, today the role of the individual citizen and of private cultural enterprises has been greatly expanded. It has become a normal dimension of life for many persons. It has become the prevailing milieu for persons who share in civic judgment and exercise any measure of leadership. The young man or woman who does not gain some understanding of the dynamics of interaction and change will in that measure remain uneducated.

THE LIBERALLY EDUCATED STUDENT

The new strategy of liberal learning can best be described it terms of the qualities a liberally educated student should prossess. Not every student will possess all of these qualities, but taken together they suggest the ways in which liberal learning must be modified to meet current world needs.

The student enlightened by liberal learning must be aware of the revolutionary scale of the changes wrought in the world during this century. He must perceive clearly the major forces at work, both at home and abroad. He must have a feeling for history and a capacity to project present trends into the future. He must know how to use his historical knowledge to test his projections. With such intellectual skills he will be equipped to understand the technological revolution that has swept the world, the wave of modernization, the new configurations of ideology, the economic relationships and political affinities. He will be prepared to understand and assess the effects of the Communist revolution.

To understand a culture other than his own, whether in the West or beyond, the student must first acquire a clear perception of the meaning of culture. He must learn to compare his culture with another, to seek out what they may have in common, where they differ in structure, content and dynamic. He must discover how the peoples in his and in other cultures go about solving the same kinds of problems. He must penetrate as deeply as possible into the history and living forces of the culture he seeks to compare with his own.

The requirements for understanding a culture outside the Western tradition vary widely according to the source of judgment. Many specialists on Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Soviet Union insist that only an adequate knowledge of the indigenous languages will provide meaningful insights. This reasoning is familiar to those steeped in the tradition of liberal learning, where the knowledge of a language, classical or modern, has always been regarded as an essential key to the literature, thought, and customs of a people. Others believe that, valuable as the language may be, it is not always indispensable. They hold that by using European languages, students can reach an adequate level of understanding, especially now that good translations of works from non-European cultures are becoming available. For the undergraduate a good translation may be a better vehicle for understanding than a poor knowledge of the language.

The extension of liberal learning to foreign cultures will involve the student in adventures with unfamiliar philosophies and religions, traditions and values. The liberal tradition in our education is essentially a product of the West. It was born of Hellenic thought, strengthened by the Roman and Judeo-Christian heritage, rediscovered in the high Middle Ages, and reemphasized by the humanistic revival of the Renaissance. It stresses the individual human being, the liberation of his intellect and talents, and their realization in the society of which he is a part.

The experience of those who have worked intensively with foreign cultures demonstrates that by learning to know the institutions, practices, and beliefs of another society, the student is forced to reexamine those of his own. Inevitably he acquires greater knowledge and understanding of both. He emerges with respect for the traditional values of the second culture, and also with a deeper and more conscious respect for those of his own. This must be regarded as an essential characteristic of the liberally educated student.

By means of the comparative approach, furthermore, he will learn to see cultural traits in perspective and to judge them with some objectivity. He will discover some of the likenesses and differences among cultures. He will see the relationships among them, and begin to appreciate the value of diversity as against standardization in the world. The liberally educated student will grow in stature to the extent that his mind is stretched to encompass the ways of life, the thought and the creative expression of other cultures. Out of this experience, which hopefully will be shared in their own way by young men and women reared in other cultures, there should emerge not only clearer perspectives but also the kinds of borrowing, adaptation and synthesis that have led historically to new bursts of creative effort.

Not only must the student learn about other cultures, he must also be made aware of the continuous interaction among peoples, cultures and states, of which he is a part. When he understands the dynamics of interaction, history will become more meaningful, and he will gain new insight into how his world came into being. He will discover how Asian art forms moved to Europe and there influenced the development of European art. He will discover how modernization moved, piecemeal and by fits and starts, from Europe and the United States to Russia, to Asian and African countries and to those of Latin America. He will discover how the hunger of a developing nation for modernization has sometimes produced disturbance and conflict. He will see how the attributes of the modern world are absorbed by some ancient cultures, changing them; how they continue to lay upon others like a veneer and do not penetrate to the deep roots of custom and history.

He will begin to comprehend the ingredients of economic growth, and the anomalies to which it gives rise. He will discover how sensitive are the economies of some older, still developing countries, to the synthetic products poured into the streams of world commerce from the laboratories of the West. He will see how the more progressive of them parry threats to their economies with programs of diversification which they have learned from the West. He will be able to grasp and evaluate the economic and political forces that have brought about the revival of strength in Europe. He will perceive the drives and mechanisms that have given cohesion to the Common Market and have bestowed upon Europe a new world influence. He will be equipped to understand the communist revolution, and the ways in which it bends or is bent by the cultures and histories of the countries it has affected. He will be prepared to discover how Russia and mainland China seek to maintain or enlarge their respective communist domains by a combination of overt and covert instrumentalities. He will discern vividly the role of change when he contemplates how a confluence of forces in the period since the Second World War has made possible almost 20 years of vitality and prestige in the manifold endeavors of the United Nations, whereas the forces at work in the 1930's started to bring about the disintegration of the League of Nations within 12 years after its birth.

Besides such specific insights, the student who learns the processes of interaction will acquire understanding of certain broad patterns of relationship. He will become aware of the complexities of communication. He will become alert to differences in the shades of words by which truth can be confused, either deliberately or inadvertently. He will begin to discover what drives men apart and what brings them together. He will learn how force is used in combination with ideas and political alinement to achieve international goals, many of which may be entirely peaceful. He will see how little, or how much, the ties of history bind peoples in friendship and how human are the reactions of a people to the possession by another group of great power or great wealth.

These insights, and others essential to the fulfilled individual and the intelligent citizen, will develop in every life where awareness and curiosity have been aroused, broadened, and deepened by liberal learning. Let there be no misunderstanding about the realism of these educational aims and aspirations. We know from our own lives and from our daily work how thinly and how imperfectly these things are learned by any student, even under the most favorable circumstances. But we know also that the readiness and taste of an adult for that "education which begins when your formal education is over" is mostly determined, so far as liberal learning is concerned, by what happens in the undergraduate years. The resources and opportunities available to an American adult today for a lifetime of liberal learning are far greater in both scope and quality than most college graduates are prepared to exploit. In this respect today's college is not making a solid educational connection with the modern world.

TO REALIZE THE NEW STRATEGY

If a strategy of liberal learning commensurate with the changing world is to be realized, a clear-cut program of action will be required of colleges and universities. Above all, they must be imbued with a strong sense of institutional commitment to the reconceived educational program. The commitment must be so unequivocal that there develops within the institutions an articulated sense of mission. Basically this commitment and sense of mission must reside in the faculty who will transmit it to the students. But members of the faculty will be able to sustain their dedication and extend it only in the measure that they are supported by the institutions of which they are a part. The achievement of such institutional commitment will depend, in turn, upon the levels of conviction among trustees, alumni, and officers.

With commitment present, the college or university can move to meet the second requirement: development and use of its resources to achieve a program of learning that will meet the requirements of the changing world. There will be difficult but not insoluble problems to be overcome. Any effort to add a new dimension to liberal learning will have to be carried forward at the same time that the college is being asked to cope with great increases of knowledge in all fields, with larger numbers of students, with conflicting pressures from specialized education, and with crushing financial burdens. Learning about other cultures and about the processes of interaction must go forward without weakening instruction about the United States, or displacing our traditional concern with Europe and related cultural areas. The task is a formidable one, but many institutions have demonstrated that it is not beyond our capacity.

The specific means by which a new world outlook can be achieved will vary. Each college or university will have to discover for itself which changes in its educational program will come closest to meeting its requirements. The need cannot be met by half measures. Through liberal learning the aim is to achieve the capacity to see one's own actions and those of one's society in their broadest human implications. For this reason any mere patching up of existing curriculums will not suffice.

Because of the multiplication of knowledge today, the new liberal learning cannot aspire to all-inclusiveness. It must be limited to selected examples. The student must discover how to adduce from such examples the principles involved, and learn to think in terms of those principles, seeking additional information to verify or modify them as he can. He may engage in the comparative study of cultures by focusing upon one or at most two cultures other than his own. He may be able to study in depth only two or three aspects of interaction among cultures and states, before reaching some conclusions about the general process which he will go on testing as he is able to expand his knowledge.

For all these purposes, the college or university may find it advisable to modify its present courses in government, literature, or art, for example. They may become comparative courses, drawing their examples from other cultures. The traditional course in international relations may be come one in intercultural relations, or specifically in the process of interaction. Where it does not now exist, the college or university may find it appropriate to introduce a course in the economics of developing nations. Some institutions are already experimenting with a course that aims to provide the student with the means for analyzing and evaluating any culture other than his own.

Even with sincere commitment and the best of intentions, the college or university may not always be able to undertake entirely on its own the implementation of a new strategy of liberal learning. It may need to draw upon other institutions for guidance and resources. Where geographic proximity permits, the college may be able to augment its efforts by cooperation with other colleges or universities and thus overcome its limitations. In addition, there must be more systematic diffusion of educational experience on a nationwide basis. This will involve the preparation of more college-level teachers who perceive the advantages and requirements of an expanded liberal learning. It will mean the development of better teaching materials and library guides, and the mobilization of badly needed cultural resources.

Many of these necessities may be available to the college within the framework of the large and expanding university. Although the independent liberal arts college may have less immediate access to this kind of help, it is possessed of certain compensating advantages. Because of its character and normally smaller size, it is more susceptible of change and can convey with some ease to its students, faculty, and other constituencies its sense of institutional commitment. It is under less pressure from specialized schools; research usually serves, but does not dominate. its teaching.

These are details—real, stubborn, and essential—and they must never be overlooked. But they must not obscure the central fact that the reorientation of liberal learning to encompass the great revolution in world relationships calls for nothing less than a major change of purpose and the application of a new strategy. The necessary adaptation of courses and programs and resources will follow. The ultimate result must reflect a comprehensive rethinking, not a mere reshuffling of premises, concepts and content. The same is true for the apparatus of undergraduate liberal learning. There must be a careful fitting of means to purposes, and no mere juggling of arrangements without regard to the central purposes of the new strategy.

If we are to bring into being the new strategy of liberal learning, we must inevitably run some risks of being less than profound. We can reduce these risks by recognizing that area knowledge, language competence, and a sophisticated sense of how the world works, will be required of those who build the world component into liberal learning. Of the teacher-scholars who perform this task, we must require the tolerant recognition that the man of liberal learning is better off with an intelligent layman's awareness of what the scholar knows in professional detail, than he is with no awareness at all. Awareness need never remain superficial in an educated man, whereas any unawareness is certain to be ignorance, probably compounded by arrogance. ("The College and World Affairs.")

Retooling for a New Liberal Arts Program

by Warren L. Hickman[1]

Mr. Hickman is senior research associate at the Social Studies Curriculum Center, Syracuse University.

A great deal is being said and written about proliferation and fragmentation in the curriculums of liberal arts colleges. At the same time, a second important criticism is being introduced. The narrowness of a purely Western-oriented curriculum is becoming more and more apparent in our age of expanding world commitments.

It is ironical that, even as our liberal arts colleges are staggering under the burden of "too many courses," we are unable to present a sufficiently broad offering to assure a world perspective rather than a limited view of the Western World.

Plans are being proposed, and in some cases are in operation, which are aimed at paring extremely specialized courses from the liberal arts curriculum. Curricular revisions are being studied by faculty committees across the Nation. Other faculty and administrative officers are busily preparing or are already experimentally offering "World Civilization" courses to replace the old standby, "Western Civilization."

But this is not a solution to the problem of offering an education with a world perspective. Changing a freshman course in Western civilization to one or two courses in world history, or replacing a sophomore introduction to English and American literature with a comparative literature survey, fails to cope with the problem. With the exception of a handful of electives such as Far Eastern history or comparative government, the remainder of the curriculum is Western oriented. And even these exceptions are selected by only a small percentage of the total enrollment.

Examine the course offerings of the average liberal arts departments. What do you find?

Economics

Principles of Economics
Money and Banking
Corporation Finance
History of Economic Analysis
Government and Business
Public Finance
Marketing
Business Organization
International Economics
*Corporative Economics
Economic Statistics

Philosophy

Greek Philosophy
Modern Philosophy
Logic
Ethics
Philosophy of Science
Contemporary Science
Social Philosophy
Aesthetics

---

[1] © 1964, Association of American Colleges.

Government

American Government
State and Local Government
Municipal Government
Constitutional Law
*Comparative Government
Public Administration
*International Relations
Public Opinion and Propaganda
Political Parties

***English* (Literature)**

Introduction to Western Literature
English Literature
American Literature
Shakespeare
Chaucer
English Novel
Dramatic Literature
Creative Writing
Journalism
Victorian Literature
18th Century Literature
Romantic Literature

Only those courses marked with an asterisk venture outside the Western pale. The enrollments in these electives are often so low that the courses are not offered every year. In meeting departmental requirements and preparing for a job, most students fail to find time to add these non-Western courses to their programs. We could repeat the above pattern in listing the offerings of other departments. The above areas, however, generally meet the description of "broadening general education."

Adding a few world-orientation or survey courses is not enough. This is a recognition of the problem that exists, but it is only a stopgap response to the problem. We need carefully to rewrite the entire liberal arts curriculum. And what better time is there to do this than when our administrations and faculties are becoming aware of the proliferation and overlapping which must be remedied if for no other reason than economic survival of the private liberal arts college. If we must shake up our offerings, which Earl McGrath has so aptly described as a jungle, then let us not just sort out a portion of the former offerings and stick them back into the 4-year program.

In eliminating proliferation and fragmentation we need to rewrite courses. Overlapping should be eliminated. Some courses can be absorbed by a combination of other courses. All this requires rebuilding the total offerings, a task that staggers the imagination but which must be faced. In rebuilding and rewriting, why can we not include a world approach in each discipline?

Perhaps some basic courses will need to be extended over 2 years, or will need to add credit hours per semester. For example, it would seem fitting in our age to include comparative economics within the basic principles course. At present most colleges teach the principles of free-enterprise economics. A graduate working for any corporation with dealings on the international scene, or seeking a post in the Foreign Service, the Armed Forces, foreign aid programs, or any of scores of other positions, should certainly understand the workings of a Socialist economy, a Communist economy and a Fascist economy. We may speak glibly of "natural economic laws," but the pattern of governmental control dictates most of the economic activity *of the world today.* Should we permit a student to graduate in order to become an economic liaison officer with the Spanish Government in a deal for an airbase without a knowledge of the Fascist economy? Can we permit our graduates to deal with state trading organs in Russia, or represent an industry in its Scandinavian or Indian offices, without knowledge of Communist and Socialist economies? We must educate for the world we live in.

That which is suggested for economics should also be undertaken in other departments. But this involves the very real problem of faculty competence in these new areas. Most liberal arts faculty members have been educated at both undergraduate and graduate levels with a totally Western background. The very people who must rebuild the curriculum and rewrite the courses are the product of the program we are proposing to discard. The same graduate specialization which has been decried as turning out graduates poorly prepared to teach undergraduate "general education," has also turned out many professors who have never once, from the first day of their freshman year to the day of receiving their Ph. D., had one single bit of instruction about any part of the globe other than the United States and Western Europe. Not even Canada or Latin America was included in their Western orientation. At the graduate level they are quite likely to have concentrated in Shakespeare, finance, or public administration to the total exclusion of all areas of culture other than the United States and England.

How do we build a world-oriented curriculum with a Western-oriented faculty? Dr. Ward Morehouse, consultant to the New York State Department of Education in foreign area studies, has proposed summer seminars such as he so ably directed in New York universities during the summer of 1963. These seminars have been effective within specific disciplines. The expansion of this program should be encouraged by foundations and other supporters.

But the seminars have attracted mainly professors with an interest and some background in the area they wish to study further. We have thousands of professors in our liberal arts colleges today who are excellent classroom teachers and extremely competent in their own fields. These same professors, however, would find it difficult to profit fully from a specialized seminar in Soviet economics or Latin American literature if they had no other background whatsoever in the political, social, economic, or literary life of those regions. Before we can best utilize highly specialized programs in the major fields of our professors, we must give them an opportunity to build a general world background of their own.

We may be fortunate that our two problems have arisen at the same time. Elimination of proliferation and fragmentation of departmental offerings will reduce the number of faculty members required for the same enrollment in each department. It would appear that in the period of transition this would furnish us with a means of self-instruction by faculty units.

A faculty contemplating a rebuilding of the curriculum could plan the reassignment of courses in such a way as to release "foreign" area specialists from at least one course. If, for example, a department of history were to contemplate cutting back from nearly 70 hours of offerings to less than 55 hours, there would be about 15 hours of faculty load released from the schedule. Do we drop one or two members of the faculty? In some institutions all the history staff may have tenure. Looking ahead, there may be a retirement coming up in 2 or 3 years, or the administration may be planning an expansion of enrollment in the released classrooms which would in another 2 or 3 years call for 15 hours of extra sections of basic courses.

In such a department of history, the professors teaching Far Eastern history, Latin American history, Middle Eastern history and Russian history could each drop a course from their load. Add to these faculty members the professors who may have had some work in oriental philosophies and religions, Latin American literature, (from either the language or the literature staff), Russian literature, comparative government and comparative economics. There will probably be other similar areas available in most liberal arts faculties. These faculty members could then be organized as an internal staff of instruction to offer and develop a world background for the entire faculty.

Seminars or lectures could be offered by this staff in such a pattern as to permit other faculty members to make a round of area orientations over a 2- or 3-year period. The faculty could be broken up into seminar-sized groups which could begin with different areas—the order would not be important—thus balancing each area over a period of 3 years.

By the time the faculty members who did have a background in a non-Western area had been taken care of by summer seminars or other advanced offerings, the rest of the faculty would have a general education in non-Western areas and could profit by these same advanced summer seminars.

If we can tackle our twin problems simultaneously we may be able to kill two birds with one stone. Should a faculty determine that it desired to follow the many recommendations now before the liberal arts colleges for trimming back the extensive offerings of the catalog, this approach would permit them at the same time to meet the problem of developing non-Western areas of study *without* adding to the college budget.

Trustees and administrators would be well advised to consider this opportunity available only during a period of transition. On the other hand, if the liberal arts college contemplating the development of more non-Western facets is one which has already developed a tight curricular offering, the trustees might consider the advisability of reducing loads for staff instruction as a priority budget item.

Above all, such a program should not be undertaken hit or miss. The program should be well planned at the basic stage. If certain staff are completely lacking, such as a professor with a background in Far Eastern history, this could well be considered when the next person is added to the history staff. A small college faculty would be wise to build its staff with one expert in each geographical or cultural region for each general disciplinary division. This would insure a continuing internal staff for the further development of non-Western backgrounds of future additions to the faculty.

On paper, this sounds fairly simple. On a campus it is a tremendously complicated matter. But never before were the private liberal arts colleges so challenged with regard to economic survival and expansion of viewpoint. From foundations and college trustees down to the newest instructor, the liberal arts college will need cooperation to undertake such an extensive rebuilding operation. Yet the occurrence of our two major problems at the same time may present us with a unique opportunity for enlisting such cooperation. (*Liberal Education*, March 1964.)

Toward a Universal Curriculum

by F. Champion Ward

In an address to the 1962 annual meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans, Mr. Ward defined his idea of a universal curriculum and how such a curriculum might actually be developed as the central principle of a liberal education. Mr. Ward is deputy vice president for international programs of the Ford Foundation.

Let me say first what I don't mean by a "universal" curriculum. I do not advocate an exhaustive survey, or even an impartial sampling, of all cultures, simply because they are there to be known about. That is the task of a universal anthropology, not of a universal curriculum. Nor do I advocate an excursion into the remote and exotic, *à la* Marco Polo. The standpoint of the American Express Co., which calls a skirt and blouse "national dress" but a sari "national costume," is not the standpoint from which a universal curriculum should be constructed. Nor am I arguing that growth in tolerance and understanding strictly entails the study of non-Western cultures. There is plenty in Western culture which is exotic to American collegians, and the problem of getting a cheerful High-Y president from an Iowa high school really to understand a Nazi concentration camp is no easier than getting him to understand the Samurai of medieval Japan. Nor would a universal curriculum be justified by the fact that some students need to be prepared for special roles in special areas abroad. Finally, I do not aim at either a synopsis or a common residue of diverse human ideas, values, and social forms. A universal curriculum would neither proclaim the higher truth, which different cultures have struggled incompletely to achieve, nor seek to abstract their highest common denominator.

I accept the received conception of liberal education as seeking to develop a matrix of ideas, values, knowledge, and methods whereby synthesis may be sought rationally by the student himself. My quarrel is not with the ends sought by liberal education but with its present scope.

By a universal curriculum, I mean one which selects its matter impartially from the products of all the major cultures of the world, in accordance with the principle of the best. This is a rather radical conception, and I venture to say that any faculty which attempts to realize it in practice will never be the same again. Neither will its students, or its dean.

Let us examine the obstacles, theoretical and practical, which would have to be overcome in such an attempt.

So long as "coverage of content," however thin and evanescent it might be, remained the aim of general studies in our colleges, the difficulties in the way of stretching curricular pretensions beyond the wide limits of what Santayana calls "respectability and Christendom" could be fairly described as insurmountable. To inform the student, even in outline, concerning the context within which the major works, ideas, and problems of "Western man" have emerged, and to mention or classify each of those items at least once for each student in 4 years, was itself an almost impossible task. Small wonder, then, that most of us who were taught on this principle were left, like Santayana, to think vaguely of the East as consisting of "immense continents swarming with Chinamen, polished and industrious, obscene and philosophical." We might regret our vacuity, but there was little to be done about it.

As an undergraduate, I "majored" in the "history of art." I see now that it was really the history of Western art that I studied. There was one course in oriental art but I was too busy with minor Flemish painters to take it. Similarly, courses in Indian philosophy are often taught as if they had nothing to do with philosophy (and when they are taught by Sanskritists, this is often all too true).

There is more hope in the now-prevalent conception of liberal education as initiating the student into a lifelong process of self-education by means of intensive examination of selected works, ideas, and problems. At least, on this view of general education, time can be given to the examination of exemplars which are considered to be of major importance, whether or not they are all internally related within a single recognized line of development or cultural nexus, the industrial revolution, for example, or the Renaissance. Moreover, the current practice of juxtaposing major expressions of artistic genius or philosophical speculation or scientific inquiry or practical policy for the purposes of analytical comparison by the student could in theory draw its materials from beyond the precincts of Western civilization. In courses in the humanities particularly, there would be no radical novelty or incoherence, and presumably much edification, in instituting such comparisons between, say, the rule of conduct set forth in the *Bhagavad Gita* and that expounded by Kant, between Machiavelli's theories of statecraft and those of Chanakya, between Iqbal and Nietzsche, Confucius and Montaigne, Aesop and the *Panchatantra*, the *Iliad* and the *Ramayana*, Chartres and Nikko, Pompeii, and Petra, the opera according to Peking and that according to Bayreuth.

In listing these East-West pairs of exemplars, I am not arguing either that two-termed comparison is a preferred mode of analysis in the humanities, or that, in respect of a topic, an "Eastern" and a "Western" treatment of it ought always to be compared or contrasted. If all works of excellence from East, West, and south of Suez are made equally eligible for humanistic analysis, many ways of treating them will be in order. I would venture to hope, however, that "East" and "West" would not be viewed primarily in terms of their "influences" upon each other. From the humanistic point of view, it seems more important to note any formal affinities between Plato's thought and that of some "Eastern" thinkers than to wonder whether or not Plato really did make a journey to Egypt and whom he may have met there. (Are we to read the *Upanishads* only because Schopenhauer read them? If that had been Schopenhauer's criterion, would *he* have read the *Upanishads?*)

In history and political science, anthropology, sociology, and economics, the possibilities are equally evident, but they invite a different curricular treatment. The resources and perspectives which these disciplines supply are already being employed, albeit haltingly, in the struggle in which Americans are now everywhere engaged to do less harm than good as technical consultants, philanthropists, cultural attachés, publicists, and diplomats in the materially underdeveloped countries. These first efforts have already shown how much we still have to learn about "the cultural implications of technological change," the "economics of rapid development," "intercultural communication," et cetera. In a universal curriculum, therefore, the social sciences might usefully be taught in terms of the perspectives which they can be made to throw upon questions of theory and practice which arise in the attempt to solve problems of "development," to adopt appropriate international policies, and to appraise possible new admixtures of "Western" and "non-Western" social forms and values. Again, the current emphasis in general education in the social sciences upon the critical examination of selected social problems would appear to make this procedure feasible.

Consider for a moment the growing prominence of "developmental economics" in current economic discussion. Western-trained economists in developing countries and Western economists now attempting to advise and assist such countries are encountering problems to which principles derived from developed economies must be adapted in new and interesting ways. These problems are particularly edifying in new countries where economic planning is prominent, and where explicit national debate goes on concerning the relative investment to be made in education at different levels, in small as against large industry, in "labor-intensive" projects, in agricultural or industrial development, *et cetera.* The intricate interplay of political, social. and economic considerations which "planning" decisions of this sort must take into account should be especially instructive to students bent on learning how the social sciences can throw some rational light into the cave of practical life.

Examples of this interplay at a very concrete level are given by the anthropologist, Mr. McKim Marriott, in his studies of the obstacles facing the permanent adoption of improved agricultural and medical practices in North India. A new kind of wheat which made its case to the farmer in terms of increased yield and income nevertheless encountered objections from the farmer's wife when she learned that the new wheat made less tasty *chapattis*, less cohesive thatch, and less adhesive "plaster" for floor and walls. Similarly, the acceptance of the modern doctor is resisted when the doctor appears as simply one more remote *sahib*, external to the familiar village society within which the local *ved* has long been an accepted member. Again, African wives who were supposed to have been "liberated" from the drudgery of life in the bush by moving to model townships in a southern Rhodesian city were, in fact, rendered bitterly unhappy by separation from the network of countervailing forces normally available to village wives in the persons of her male relatives. Left alone with her husband in the city, without these traditional allies, the wife lost status rapidly, and all the water taps, good housing, and other amenities provided by paternalism could not restore it.

Students of political science and constitutional law who wish to study constitutions in the making could do no better than to turn to present-day Africa. There, in Nigeria, in the *Conseil de l'Entente*, in the federations of east and central Africa, unique combinations of racial, tribal, and provincial interests with the most sophisticated Western political ideas and devices are being worked out. Again, in Ghana and Tanganyika among many, one-party states are emerging which are neither wholly totalitarian nor wholly democratic. If such students look carefully enough at recent African political evolution, they may even clear their minds of cant about such shopworn topics as "colonialism," as they come upon cases of privilege combined with tutelage, privilege without tutelage, and, now in prospect and most confusing to the Marxist, tutelage without privilege.

In mathematics and the natural sciences, the curriculum is already universal in the sense here employed. We are by now accustomed to the internationalism of mathematicians and natural scientists, who have long disconcerted political nationalists and cultural chauvinists, simply by taking knowledge where they find it.

Until recently, the problem of securing teachers for a curriculum making wide use of materials drawn from non-European cultures was regarded as insoluble. Subsequently, thanks to farsighted efforts by several American universities and foundations, a substantial and increasing number of young scholars, both in the humanities and in the social sciences, have been enabled to live and study in Asia and Africa as part of their specialized study of the art, thought, languages, and societies of those regions. At the same time, the work of already established departments and institutes of Asian studies has been supported and enlarged in scope, and provisions have in some cases been made for established scholars and teachers whose present competence lies entirely within the European tradition to be relieved of ordinary duties for a time in order to add new strings to their bows. Finally, Asian scholars from newly independent nations are being enabled to visit the United States in increasing numbers. I am aware of the limitations of some of these procedures, but, taken together, they should make it possible for experimental beginnings to be made and expanded on a somewhat better than "bootstrap" basis. And, once such beginnings have been made, they should act as a stimulus to appropriate higher studies.

But I have been assuming that, given methods for making them accessible, the products of non-European cultures would be worthy material for inclusion in a general education designed in accordance with the principle of excellence. Is this by now a safe assumption, or must the ghost of Macaulay's dictum of 1835, that "a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia," be laid once more? In reply, I point to a single phenomenon which may have struck those of you who have visited Asia, and particularly India, or who have observed superior Asian students and scholars here in the United States. In India, one encounters persons who are thoroughly familiar with both Shakespeare and Kalidasa, with both European and Asian music, with the Bible as well as the Gita. (Because he quoted easily and pertinently from the Bible during a tour of the United States, one Brahmin of my acquaintance was invariably asked, "Aren't you a Christian?" His invariable and Delphic reply was: "Yes, I am a Christian. I am also a Hindu.") Are we to assume that only Indians are capable of such catholicity or that only patriotism accounts for their apparently equal appreciation of Western and Eastern cultures? Does it not seem more likely that the peaks of both cultures are found to be comparable in height by those who have learned to ascend them with unsquinting eyes?

Of course, I do not contend that appreciation of "other" cultures should be accomplished through depreciation of one's "own" or that topics and works should be selected from different cultures with a mechanical symmetry, where real differences in importance or excellence exist. For example, it would be as sentimental to assign equal stature to European and Asian contributions to natural science as it would be to equate German and English contributions to European music. But, except for latter-day Compteans, the command of positive science will not be a unique measure or an indispensable condition of civilization.

Suppose the merit of unfamiliar cultures to have been granted, suppose that methods adequate to a first grasp of their products are already in use in our colleges, and suppose, finally, that teachers able to teach in a universal curriculum can be found or made, will it not still be argued that other cultures are, after all, other cultures and that, since time is short, it had better be devoted to insuring that the student "comes into his own heritage?" If only a few cathedrals can be studied, must not the Blue Mosque and the Shwe Dagon pagoda be honored *in absentia?* If only two revolutions can be compared, must not Gandhi and Mao give way to Robespierre and Lenin?

In one sense of the term, the cultural heritage of today's generation of students in America is that which has explicitly shaped the mind, character, and taste of their teachers and parents and which is "there" to be apprehended and assimilated by those students in their turn. We may count upon American society in general and American schools in particular to convey this heritage to the rising generation. I have little fear that this realized legacy will lose its identity or its importance for American students, whatever else their education may include. And yet, who *are* the rising generation of Americans? Let us recall that, within the last few years, we have added many new citizens of Caribbean and Asian extraction, and that our Negro citizens have begun to take a new and positive interest in their African origins. In this quite literal sense, we Americans are the only planetary people. This fact should serve to remind us that a living legacy is never simply carried into the present from the "settled past" (to borrow Whitehead's terms); it is also created in and by the present. What was legacy for Aristotle had been adventure for Plato. Every occasion of experience, Whitehead reminds us, and *a fortiori* every human generation, "arises as an effect facing its past and ends as a cause facing its future." In each age the task of liberal education is to discern the future which the rising generation faces and to shape for that future an explicit legacy appropriate to its deepest requirements. I submit that, in our time, this legacy must be drawn from a reservoir as wide and various as the human spirit and as deep as its most profound achievements. For we are at last persuaded by sheer circumstance to join in the classical profession of Terence; we can now begin to see that our "tribe" is mankind and henceforth nothing that is human can we count alien to us. (Proceedings, 17th annual meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans, 1962.)

Undergraduate International Programs: A Rationale and an Approach

by Wallace L. Anderson

Mr. Anderson, dean of undergraduate studies at the State College of Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa, delivered one of the addresses at a 1966 conference on education and world affairs which was cosponsored by Education and World Affairs and the State University of Iowa at Iowa City.

Education and world affairs are not exactly strangers. In one sense, they have always been partners, if we think in terms of modifications in culture that have occurred at various times and various places as a result of the interaction of people and ideas. What is new about the partnership in our times is our consciousness of the relationship, our sense of its importance in our lives, and the multiplicity and diversity of agencies and programs devoted to education and world affairs, energetically fostering intercultural activities. Governments, industry, philanthropic foundations, and institutions of higher education, here and abroad, separately and in combination, have woven a huge web of interrelated, and often overlapping, international programs of one kind or another, ranging in scope from the global operations of UNESCO and the Peace Corps to highly specialized and localized studies of individual scholars in what used to be the outermost reaches of the earth. * * *

Our main concern [at this conference] is with implications of education and world affairs for the undergraduate curriculum. To help point the way, it may be useful to trace, in broad outline, the major developments in what we loosely term international education.

The first stage began in the period between World War I and World War II with programs devoted to the study of international relations or international affairs, sometimes also called foreign affairs. Primarily concerned with politics and diplomacy, these programs were attempts to keep abreast of current developments and shifting national alinements, especially among the major powers, as the United States moved into a position of world leadership. These programs have continued down to the present, though they have merged, to some extent, with programs of stage two.

The second stage was the development of area study programs. An outgrowth of World War II and the hot and cold wars since, these programs differ from the earlier international affairs programs in being both broader and at the same time more specialized. Interdisciplinary and regional in character, concerned with the language and culture, past and present, of a given area, they quickly branched out into numerous subdivisions, for example, Asian studies, East Asian studies, southeast Asian studies; Inner Mongolian studies, Outer Mongolian studies, African studies, North African studies, Sub-Saharan studies, South African studies, and so forth. Today there is probably no region of the globe that is not included somewhere in an area study program of some sort.

For the most part, both the international affairs programs and the foreign area study programs were graduate programs, with the greatest developments taking place in the large university centers. The 4-year undergraduate program was affected only slightly. Some of the stronger liberal arts college developed international affairs programs, largely western in content, and some specialized programs in the social sciences that were in effect feeder programs for the graduate international and foreign area study programs. A few courses, international in nature, developed somewhat sporadically, for example, international marketing, foreign trade problems, comparative education, comparative religions, and the like. Since World War II, study abroad programs, as well as exchange programs involving foreign students on American campuses, have developed an international outlook in a number of undergraduate colleges. However, though the exchange students came from widely scattered places, our own undergraduates went mainly to Europe. Although there has been some growth in international education at the undergraduate level, it has been unsystematic in its development and it has been largely Western in its outlook. The typical 4-year undergraduate curriculum as a whole has remained almost wholly Western in its orientation. Perhaps, under the circumstances, I should say in its occidentation!

Changes, however, are on the way. Stage three has in fact begun. A number of colleges—Dartmouth, Antioch, Earlham, the State University of New York at New Paltz, as well as the State College of Iowa—to name a few, have taken steps to extend the undergraduate curriculum beyond the confines of the Western world. Our presence here today in itself is significant recognition that international education ought to play a larger part in the undergraduate program of studies. The direction, it seems to me, is clear, but the reasons for extending the international dimension of the college curriculum have been sometimes oversimplified. International education to what purpose? The need is greater and more compelling than ever, and it extends, I believe, beyond the colleges and the universities.

As the physical world has shrunk, the scope of education has expanded. Formerly the curriculum, especially in the public schools, was limited to the local needs of an isolated community. Formerly the transmission of ideas, of cultural influences, was a slow process. It took more than two centuries, for example, for the Renaissance to spread from Italy to England. This state of affairs, as you well know, is no longer true. Whatever happens anywhere is known everywhere simultaneously. If Mao Tse Tung sneezes in Peiping, Sukarno catches cold in Jakarta, and we feel the chill on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Just as we have instant coffee and instant tea, we now have instant knowledge and instant influence. Witness the "international" style in art and architecture that has taken hold in major cities of the world in an incredibly short time. We are living in a new world. Our children know it, and we know it too, but we have just begun to comprehend it and to acknowledge that it has a place in the curriculum. The traditional way in which curricular changes have reached the colleges and schools has been through the trickle process:

research in the graduate schools, filtered through to the colleges, trickled down to the high schools, and, a generation later, dribbled down to the elementary schools. In a jet age, this is indeed a slow boat to China.

As a consequence of the expanded world in which we live, we need—all along the line of education, from the graduate school to the kindergarten, and by cooperative efforts—to extend the international dimension in our educational programs. Traditionally, and with good reason, our curriculum has been centered in our own history and culture, the history and culture of the United States and of Western civilization. And this should, for good reason, continue to be dominant. But we must also widen our vision.

A recent report on education in New York state * * * indicated that the average high school student spends less than 2 percent of his time studying those parts of the world that contain two-thirds of the world's population, and whose historical record goes much farther back than our own. The college situation across the country is not much better. With a few notable exceptions, at most colleges fewer than 10 percent of the students elect courses dealing with the non-Western World.

The most general reason for extending the international dimension at the undergraduate level, to put it simply, is to update the curriculum. There are dangers, however, that we may think only in contemporary terms, that we may interpret "updating" from too limited a view.

The reason most often advanced for international studies is the value for citizenship. The power struggle in international politics, the developing nations, the population explosion, the aspirations of everyone to share in human dignity everywhere—all these lend forceful validity to the argument. Note, however, that the emphasis here is on the contemporary scene. Important as it is, such a view of international studies is a limited one.

A second reason, even more important, is based on cultural values: the importance of knowing other people with other ways of life. Such a study is intrinsically valuable in its own right. It is also a means of gaining perspective on one's own values and traditions. To achieve this, a study of the contemporary world alone is not sufficient. We need to get at the roots of things. We need to know not only the present but also the past; we need to become acquainted not only with our Western heritage but with the rich cultural heritages of other peoples. * * *

A third reason, especially important for us as members of college and university faculties, is based on scholarly values. Our scholarship should not be limited to that of the Western World; we should draw upon the total resources of the scholarly world. Indeed, the fulfillment of reasons one and two are dependent upon our doing so.

For all these reasons, then, we need to extend international studies at the undergraduate level. Moreover, we need to extend them beyond the confines of the Western World, and in such a way as to reach all our students. How this is to be done will necessarily vary from college to college; each institution will have to work out a program appropriate to its interests and resources. As an example of one approach to international studies, let me illustrate by describing briefly what we are doing at the State College of Iowa. May I also acknowledge our gratitude to the Ford Foundation for a 5-year grant to assist us in developing this program of intercultural studies.

The faculty of the State College of Iowa believes that as part of a liberal education all students should have (1) intellectual contact in some depth with a living culture and society other than their own; (2) some awareness of the significant and exciting esthetic contributions made by other peoples to world culture; and (3) some knowledge of the ways in which other peoples, regardless of time and place, have solved their problems and satisfied their needs. To achieve this goal, we have placed at the heart of the program a general education requirement, applicable to all students, that may be satisfied by taking one of two courses: "Foreign Area Studies—China" or "Foreign Area Studies—India." It was agreed at the outset that each course (1) should include material from both the humanities and the social and behavioral sciences; (2) should include both contemporary and traditional material; and (3) should not be organized to treat one narrow topic within a given culture area. Each course is a three-semester hour course to be taken in the junior or senior year, after the student has taken the basic required humanities courses in Western civilization. The China course was first offered in two sections last summer. In the fall, there were 5 sections, with a total of 143 students enrolled. This spring there are 9 sections, with 272 students. The India course will be offered for the first time in the fall. When both are in full operation, approximately 1,500 students will be enrolled in any given year.

These courses will be staffed by China and India specialists, who will also teach some of the traditional courses in their disciplines; from time to time they will also teach more advanced area study courses as they develop. To get fully qualified staff to take on this type of assignment, I must admit, is no easy task. In addition to building our staff, we are also building our library to support the course offerings and to provide basic research material for the faculty.

In the hope of making the curriculum as a whole more international, we are inaugurating a faculty development plan. By means of on-campus seminars and by opportunities for further study in an area center, either in the United States or abroad, we hope to encourage faculty members to acquaint themselves with some aspects of the non-Western World. In 1966, a seminar on China will be offered; in 1967, the topic will be India. At least 10 seminar meetings will be held each year, with approximately 15 faculty members participating, and with distinguished visiting scholars as leaders. Each faculty member will pursue an individual project in his field of knowledge. The idea is not to make Asian specialists of them but to have them extend their knowledge in their own disciplines, and to have it play back into their teaching, either in courses already established or in courses to be introduced as a result of their study. The members of the seminar for 1966 have already been selected, and plans are moving ahead.

A final part of the program is an effort to extend foreign area studies beyond the limits of the college. We have, as you know, a strong teacher-education program and a laboratory school. The laboratory school is currently working on a revision of its social studies curriculum from the kindergarten through grade 12, with the idea of rebuilding it from an international viewpoint. A 12th grade foreign area studies class was begun this year. A close relationship has been established between the instructor of the social science methods course at the college and the supervising teachers in the laboratory school. The plan is to develop some student teachers who will have special preparation in foreign area studies and to have them do their student teaching at the laboratory school. Hopefully they will then carry their knowledge and experience into the public schools as they go out to teach.

Although many of our plans are still in the blueprint stage, we hope by a continuing effort along these lines that we can update the curriculum at the State College of Iowa by giving it an international dimension. In doing so, it is not our intent to play down the importance of a knowledge of our own history and culture. Far from it. Indeed, we need to know this first and well. It is our base, our point of view. Without it, we could not even begin to understand another people or another culture. We need to maintain our own independent and indigenous way of life and value system. But we also need to recognize that we are increasingly interdependent. We are no longer physically isolated; we cannot remain intellectually isolated.

In conclusion, let me say that this international dimension cannot be added to the curriculum by merely inserting a unit or two of this or that into a course in world history, or a course in literature, or what have you. It must derive ultimately from faculty who are themselves more knowledgeable in their fields and who are, both literally and figuratively, more widely traveled—in short, by scholars who are themselves internationally minded. (Address, Conference on Education and World Affairs, Iowa City, Iowa, Apr. 22, 1966.)

The World in Higher Education

by C. Easton Rothwell

Mr. Rothwell, president of Mills College, Oakland, Calif., spoke at a conference on "The International Dimension in the California State Colleges," a 2-day discussion held early in 1966 and jointly sponsored by the California State Colleges and Education and World Affairs.

How * * * do we use our rich, present-day resources, both material and human, to educate our rapidly growing body of college students to an adequate understanding of their work? How do we educate them to that level of personal and civic comprehension that the Greek city-state expected of its citizenry? How do we relate this learning to the liberal education of the undergraduate and his dawning professional and vocational interests? How do we relate it to the specialized world of the graduate student? How do we begin to introduce essential concepts and inquiries into the high school and elementary school, or build upon what they have already started? How do we create a nation whose citizenry has a profound understanding of intercultural and international relations commensurate with the power and obligations of that nation?

I do not propose to answer all these questions. I could not do so. * * * I hope they will haunt us in the months and years ahead until we have found workable answers to them.

Today I shall confine myself to making four brief suggestions for the purpose of launching these discussions. * * *

First. We should take every step possible to improve, as far as possible, our resources for doing the job. I mean, of course, the building of library materials, including the audiovisual. An ever-growing body of materials is available in books and journals, on film and tape. There are excellent materials in English as well as in the indigenous languages of other peoples.

In addition, we need more members of our faculties who have traveled, lived, and worked in other cultures. * * * Our own experience at Mills College—sending one-third of our faculty to Asia—indicates that travel and study abroad must be carefully oriented and rigorously planned if those who go are to derive benefits commensurate with the costs. Ways must be found to multiply the impact they have upon our own institutions when they return.

We also need more foreign scholars of competence as visitors to our campuses. And the program for their use must be worked out with utmost care, as well as for the intelligent and nonexploitative use of foreign students.

We need more carefully worked out plans for sending our students abroad and for integrating their experience into our own educational programs when they return. And beyond these things, we need in our faculties and in our student bodies more persons who have watched the political process work at the State and National levels and who comprehend the intricacies of decision making. So much for resources.

Second. Every student should have the opportunity to experience in reasonable depth a culture other than his own, and preferably a culture outside the Western tradition. Ideally, he should experience that culture firsthand, in addition to learning about it in the classroom. But the classroom or seminar can be a reasonable substitute. Moreover, the materials now available in English are adequate to create a sure insight and to invoke the intellectual curiosity necessary to further study. Many colleges and universities have found this to be true in area studies. At Mills College we have obtained high levels of understanding through individual courses relating to non-Western cultures, through interdisciplinary programs, and through an innovative course called Styles of Civilizations, which originally applied to Indian and China and now is being transposed to Africa and the Middle East.

Under whatever program, the knowledge which the student derives should lead him to meaningful comparisons with his own society and other Western societies. Moreover, it should equip him to reach tenable judgments about other societies—about India, for example, or Malaysia, or Japan.

Third. The education of every student should provide him with opportunity to learn how to see the totality of relationships among peoples, cultures, and governments. This is more difficult than learning about a single culture. It is an art consonant with genuine maturity. It is indispensable to sound judgment on political, military, economic, or social matters. We shamefully neglect it in our colleges and universities. This suggests that there is need in our curriculums for courses or seminars, necessarily interdisciplinary in character, to afford such education. They are extremely rare, but they must be conceived as belonging in undergraduate as well as graduate work.

Fourth and finally, these steps and others that must be taken to create a generation with sophisticated understanding of the world cannot and should not be regarded as something "added on" to an education. They are rather an integral part of learning in this century of swift and sweeping revolution. They constitute a new dimension in the essential learning, the liberal learning, of every man and woman.

Where once we studied the civilizations of Europe, together with their cradle cultures in the eastern Mediterranean, we must now include selectively and comparatively those of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. To our study of art, music, and dance must be added those of additional continents. We must understand how those peoples answer the essential questions of living, governing, expressing themselves, as we now answer such questions about ourselves.

Above all, we must understand how they relate to us and to the rest of the world in their eyes as well as in ours. We must appreciate their impact upon us and upon others at every point on the spectrum of world relations. Otherwise we shall be unlearned and illiterate in our own age; we shall be as dated as the dinosaur and our survival capacity will compare with his.

More importantly, if we do not do these things for the greater number of students, we shall fail to realize the full meaning of a liberating education as Mark Van Doren once envisaged it. We shall fail to achieve in our age what he described as "the power to multiply and explore choices, so that the world ceases to be a little place, trimmed to the dimensions of one's private experience." (Proceedings, Conference on the International Dimension in the California State Colleges, Los Angeles, Jan. 28–29, 1966.)

Russian and Other Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education

by Robert F. Byrnes and John M. Thompson

Non-Western studies have become an integral part of the educational program in several Indiana colleges and universities, and are in the process of becoming so in a number of others. The origins of this interest go back to a study which Prof. Robert Byrnes, then in the Department of History of Indiana University, conducted in 1958 on the state of non-Western studies throughout Indiana, which revealed that approximately 90 percent of the State's A.B.'s graduated at that time without having learned anything about any non-Western society. As a result of a conference in the autumn of 1958, the Byrnes findings were translated into a proposal for a cooperative effort among all the colleges of the State, drawing upon the resources of Indiana University, to encourage more study of the non-Western world. A Ford Foundation grant for the project, familiarly known as the Non-Western Project, was made in 1959 and later renewed through 1967.

The following paper was presented at the 1958 conference by Mr. Byrnes, now director of Indiana University's International Affairs Center, and John M. Thompson, who is director of the International Studies division of the center.

American education at all levels is under constant review by teachers, students, parents, and interested citizens. Scrutiny of higher education has been especially intense in recent years because of the steadily rising percentage of a rapidly growing population which atatends college, because of the threat to our institutions and values posed by communism and the Communist state system dominated by the Soviet Union, and because of the scientific, technical, social, and political revolutions through which we and other peoples of the world are passing. These analyses have fluctuated, with interest high during one period in the sciences, in another period in foreign languages, in a third period in some other aspect of American education. However, since the end of World War II in particular, when the United States was forced to accept large international responsibilities, many Americans have been especially concerned about the effectiveness with which our schools and colleges were preparing our students—the average as well as the academically talented—for life in a shrinking world where our obligations and interests were inevitably becoming ever more connected with those of other peoples.

In this crisis, many Americans, in examining the relevancy of our education for life in the second half of the 20th century, have been convinced that developments in science and in international affairs made necessary a radical departure from established procedures. In particular, they have come to believe that our educational systems do not pay sufficient attention to the history, intellectual activity, patterns of culture, and interests of peoples living outside the Americas and Western Europe. They demand, along with President Cornelis W. de Kiewiet, of the University of Rochester, that we attain the "pervading awareness throughout the total body of the curriculum of the great transformations in the modern world which have the cumulative effect of producing the greatest crisis in human history."

The United States has an extraordinary variety of institutions of higher education—large and small; rich and poor; urban and rural; State and private; liberal and technical and professional; religious and secular; old and new; good and bad. Consequently, while many know well one institution, or a few institutions, no one can speak with accuracy concerning American education in general and the kind of information and understanding it provides concerning other peoples in particular.

The State of Indiana was therefore selected as a sample State, and a pilot study of undergraduate education in Indiana was completed in the spring and early summer of 1958. We consider the Indiana sample fairly representative of American higher education in general, although Indiana probably has a slightly higher percentage of church-related colleges and a lower percentage of junior colleges than the country as a whole. The latter figure is raised, however, if one considers the 14 extension centers of Indiana University and of Purdue University as equivalent to junior colleges.

This paper, therefore, has drawn its conclusions, which we believe are relevant for all American undergraduate education, from an intensive study of the kind of education concerning the non-Western areas of the world which the colleges and universities of the State of Indiana now provide their undergraduates, of the problems these institutions face with regard to this particular subject, and of the objectives, methods, and ideas administrators and faculty have. It is based on the firm conviction that liberal education is indispensable to American democracy and that thorough knowledge of American and other Western history, institutions, and values must constitute the core of American liberal education. On the other hand, it also assumes that knowledge of other areas and cultures must be diffused throughout our educational system, if the latter is to keep pace with the vast changes which now affect the world and our role in it.

During the survey, 34 institutions enrolling approximately 65,000 undergraduates were studied.[1] Of these, three large universities—Indiana, Notre Dame, and Purdue—and their extension centers account for approximately half the total. Two large teachers colleges—Indiana State at Terra Haute and Ball State at Muncie—have a combined total of about 7,500 undergraduates. The remaining 29 institutions have an average undergraduate enrollment of slightly less than 1,000, with a range from 250 to above 2,000. Of these 29 colleges, 20 are small (under 1,000 in all but one case), church-related institutions: 12 Protestant and 8 Catholic. Three are small technical and engineering colleges, five are predominantly nonsectarian liberal arts institutions (although four of these have a nominal tie with a Protestant denomination), and one is a junior college; 25 of the 34 institutions are accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges & Secondary Schools.

---

[1] The survey was based on careful study of the catalogs and other published information of each institution and on conversations with presidents, deans, faculty members, and librarians on the various campuses. [The institutions in the State are listed at the end of this article.]

THE SITUATION IN THE STATE OF INDIANA

Types of institutions

Twenty-eight of the thirty-four institutions of higher education in Indiana are generally classed as liberal arts colleges. However, the majority of the students follow a purely liberal arts program in only six of these institutions. In 14 colleges, the majority of the students are enrolled in teacher training programs which include a number of education courses, or in semi-professional curricula (technical, business administration, preseminary, nursing, etc.) which include a number of specialized technical courses not of a liberal arts nature. In eight schools, about half the students follow a liberal arts program, with the other half in teacher training or semi-professional programs. Thus, on the basis of this survey, it is clear that a large number of potential teachers in American elementary and secondary schools are being trained outside of the teachers colleges and in what are generally considered liberal arts colleges. Therefore, an increase in the attention devoted to non-Western areas of the world in the undergraduate colleges would soon have a significant impact upon secondary and, to some extent, elementary education.

Teachers colleges themselves present a special opportunity so far as education relating to non-Western areas is concerned. The two large teachers colleges in Indiana have more than 7,000 students each year, while the School of Education in Indiana University and the program in education at Purdue University reach several hundred more. Most of the students in these schools learn almost nothing concerning the non-Western world, and only 1 or 2 percent study a foreign language for even 2 years. In large part, this situation is a result, as it is in most colleges, of heavy emphasis in the required curriculum on courses dealing with the history and traditions of American and Western civilization. In addition, students in the teachers colleges are generally required to allot about one-seventh of their total program to courses in educational techniques and to practice teaching. Consequently, they can take only a limited number of elective courses, few of which, in any case, deal in any way with non-Western problems. Nevertheless, these students as teachers, particularly as social studies teachers in American history, world history, and problems of democracy courses, are expected to help educate their students concerning areas and problems in the world about which their own information is at best rudimentary.

According to the testimony of teachers college faculty members, a number of teacher trainees are interested in learning about the non-Western world and in preparing themselves to carry some knowledge of other cultures to their students. For this, the current trend in teacher education toward requiring a fifth year of preparation for a number of teachers may afford real opportunities. In general, it is clear that primary and secondary education in Indiana would be enormously broadened and enriched in the long run if students in the teachers colleges and schools of education received greater incentive and opportunity to acquire some knowledge of the non-Western areas.

While teachers colleges offer a special opportunity for education concerning non-Western areas, the technical institutions present a special problem. As a rule, students in such schools complete substantially less work in the humanities and social sciences than do students in other institutions; consequently, they are normally even less exposed to material concerning the non-Western world. The liberal arts courses in these schools are therefore especially important, not only for the student as a citizen but especially for the growing number of technicians in fields such as agriculture and petroleum engineering who may eventually engage in overseas work for private companies, the Federal Government, or international organizations.

On the other hand, Soviet scientific and technical achievements have raised the question of instruction in Russian language to some prominence in the technical institutions. Several administrators and faculty members in these schools believe that Russian language training should be made available for undergraduates in science and engineering, particularly for those who may go on to graduate study. Purdue University offers Russian, which is taken by over one hundred students. . . .

The curriculum

Generally, and properly, Indiana undergraduate curricula are oriented strongly toward the history, tradition, and thought of Western European and American civilization. At the same time, scant attention is paid to the non-Western cultures. For example, Professor Joseph Coppock of Earlham College has discovered that even at that outstanding small college, with its long tradition of interest in foreign areas, only 4.2 percent of the total student semester-hours in 1957-58 were in courses having some non-Western content; only 14 percent were in courses, excluding languages, having substantial international and foreign content of all kinds (West European, Latin-American, and non-Western).

In the Indiana colleges and universities as a whole, the introductory courses taken in the social sciences and humanities by the majority of undergraduate students (some undergraduates have no courses in the social sciences or humanities) refer to Russia, East Central Europe, and Asia only in passing and to Africa hardly at all. Even the 11 courses which are histories of world civilization or general introductions to world civilization (see table I) treat non-Western cultures briefly and focus primarily on Western civilization. Most instructors in these courses have concentrated on the United States or Western European in their graduate study; consequently, they tend to give most attention to the subject matter they know best. Nevertheless, the "world civilization" courses do include more non-Western history than do the surveys of European civilization, which are the basic courses in history in most institutions.

In the humanities, 25 institutions offer a course on world literature; such a course is generally required for those in training to teach elementary school. Here again, however, the attention given non-Western cultures is minimal. In most cases, students read six or eight brief selections from Asian writers, *Crime and Punishment* by Dostoievsky or a Tolstoy novel, and a play or short story by Chekhov. Generally, this is the only attention devoted to non-Western areas in humanities courses, except where a course on comparative religions or an advanced course on modern drama or literature is offered. Such courses nod at least in the direction of other areas and cultures as they rush along. Even so, the advanced literature or drama courses, while usually including a few Russian novels or plays, seldom mention an Asian author and never an African one.

A few other general courses in particular disciplines devote some attention to the non-Western world (see table II). For example, although there is considerable variation in the way geographers treat non-Western areas and materials, some introductory geography courses—variously called "world geography," "regional geography," "economic geography," etc.—touch briefly on the non-Western parts of the world, as do surveys of European history. The latter generally deal cursorily with the rise of Russia, the expansion of Europe overseas, Marxism, imperialism and colonialism, the rise of nationalism in East Central Europe, and the events of the 20th century, in which Russia and Asia play an important role. In economics, only one or two of the beginning "Principles-of-Economics" courses give more than a passing glance to noncapitalist or non-Western economic systems. Occasionally, general courses in art and music present a smattering of Oriental art and of Orthodox church music. As a rule, the introductory or basic courses in the other disciplines ignore non-Western areas.

TABLE I.—*Indiana institutions offering basic general courses which touch briefly on non-Western areas, 1957–58*

Course	Number of institutions	Percent of total
World civilization	11	32
History of European civilization	20	59
World literature	25	74
Geography	24	70
Economics	3	9
Fine arts	12	35

TABLE II.—*Indiana instiutions offering advanced or specialized courses in disciplines which deal in part with non-Western areas, 1957–58*

Course [1]	Number of institutions	Percent of total
Europe in the 20th century	18	53
American diplomatic history	17	50
European diplomatic history	2	6
Comparative government	15	44
International relations	16	47
Current events	4	12
Political, social, or economic thought	18	53
Comparative economic systems	8	24
Economics of underdeveloped countries	3	9
Sociology or cultural anthropology	12	35
Philosophy (history of, or contemporary)	24	70
Comparative religions	17	50
Foreign missions	8	24

---

[1] In most cases, these are 1-semester courses given in alternate years and enroll primarily juniors and seniors, predominantly majors in the given discipline.

Almost every institution in Indiana offers at least a few advanced and specialized courses which treat non-Western developments more extensively than do the basic courses. However, these courses, as well as those very few courses which deal specifically with a non-Western area, are in every case advanced courses taken by a relatively small number of junior and senior students, usually majors in the given discipline. Moreover, such courses are generally offered only in alternate years. Thus, only a small proportion of the student body is exposed to non-Western areas even in situations which offer courses relating to these areas.

In history, courses in American diplomatic history, European diplomatic history, and Europe in the 20th century (all generally for one semester) devote considerably more attention to the non-Western world than do the survey courses in the history of world civilization or of European civilization. Nevertheless, the main emphasis is upon Western Europe or the United States, and the world is viewed from the point of view of the United States or Western Europe.

Only eight institutions offer courses in comparative economic systems. These are all one semester courses, and they generally follow a standard division, comparing the free enterprise, mixed, state capitalistic (fascist), and Communist economic systems. Only three institutions (two of them major universities) offer courses which deal directly and in some detail with the economics of underdeveloped countries; these courses seldom attract more than 10 students.

In political science (sometimes called politics or government), several types of courses—comparative government, international relations, and political theory—deal in part with non-Western areas and materials. The comparative government courses generally devote approximately equal amounts of time to democratic, fascist, and Communist types of government. These courses give little, if any, attention to Asian political institutions.

The courses on international relations or world politics customarily spend much time and effort on the principles of international relations, international organization, and international law. In dealing with current or recent developments, however, they naturally accord some attention to the role of Russia, Asia, and Africa.

Courses in social, political, or economic thought, which are located in different departments in different institutions, but which frequently cover a range of theory, usually treat Marxism-Leninism only briefly, and often with little expertness. Asian thought is seldom mentioned. Courses on the history of philosophy or on modern or contemporary philosophy occasionally refer to oriental philosophy or to Marxism-Leninism. Seventeen institutions, mainly Protestant church-related schools, offer courses in comparative religions, which usually touch on Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, and Confucianism. Similarly, eight church-related colleges offer courses on the history or philosophy of foreign missions; these naturally deal to some extent with non-Western areas, particularly the Far East and Africa.

In sociology and cultural anthropology, several institutions offer courses, under various names, which examine race, population, or cross-cultural problems. These sometimes draw upon non-Western areas and experience, although they usually concentrate upon American problems.

Only one Indiana institution, Indiana University, has offered an undergraduate major or minor in a non-Western area, and it has wisely abandoned its undergraduate majors in both the Russian and the East-Central European fields. Indeed, we found no interest in undergraduate area majors in any institution in the state. No institution in Indiana—probably only a few in the entire country—requires its undergraduates to pass a course dealing specifically with a foreign area, except for foreign language courses, when they are required.

Twenty institutions in Indiana offer one or more courses dealing specifically with a non-Western area or language. However, except for Indiana University and the University of Notre Dame, which have graduate programs in non-Western areas, only five institutions—Ball State Teachers College, De Pauw University, Earlham College, Purdue University, and Valparaiso University—offer more than three courses which deal mainly with a non-Western area or language. On the other hand, half a dozen or more institutions are actively considering adding at least one more course on a non-Western area within the next 2 years, and eight intend to add instruction in the Russian language.

Of those foreign area courses offered, only three or four are taught by men who have received special training on the area; the others are given by instructors who have not had specialized training, although they are often much interested, and have frequently done a remarkably effective job of educating themselves for teaching on the area.

The great bulk of the area courses are concerned with Russia or the Far East; only four courses deal with Africa and two with the Middle East. East-central Europe receives practically no attention, except at Indiana University and the University of Notre Dame and in an incidental fashion in Russian history courses.

The special courses devoted to non-Western areas are overwhelmingly in history (see table III). Eight institutions offer Russian history every year, with an estimated 300 students enrolled in these courses during 1957–58. Five colleges give Russian history in alternate years, generally for only a semester, with an average total enrollment of approximately 80 when the courses are offered. Thus, of the total Indiana undergraduate population of approximately 65,000 only about 340 students or one-half of 1 percent study the history of Russia in any one year. In view of the importance of Russia in the lives of all of us, this is an alarming situation. One hopeful sign is that another college introduced Russian history in the fall of 1958, and four others hope to add such a course in the near future.

TABLE III.—*Indiana institutions offering special courses on non-Western areas, 1957–58*

Course	Annually	Alternate years	Total	Percent of total institutions	Number of institutions interested in offering courses
Far Eastern history [1]	5	11	16	47	2
Russian history [1]	8	5	[2] 13	38	4
Asian geography	2	3	5	15	
Russian geography	2	2	4	12	
African geography	1	2	3	9	
History of Middle East		2	2	6	
Introduction to Asia and the U.S.S.R.		1	1	3	
Introduction to Africa		1	1	3	
Russian language	[3] 8		[4] 8	24	8
Uralic and Turkic languages	1		1	3	
Chinese language	1		1	3	

[1] In 2 institutions, these courses are 2 semesters in length; otherwise, they are 1-semester courses.

[2] Another college added Russian history in the fall of 1958.

[3] These courses are noncredit courses in 3 institutions.

[4] In addition, 2 more colleges introduced Russian language instruction in the fall of 1958.

Five institutions offer a course in Far Eastern history every year, with a total enrollment of about 180 students. Eleven colleges present Far Eastern history in alternate years; approximately 185 students are enrolled in these courses when they are offered. Consequently, in a given year, only about 275 Indiana undergraduates study Far Eastern history. All but two of the courses in Far Eastern history are one semester in length. About half of them comprise a brief historical survey of China and Japan, usually with some incidental attention to India; the remainder concentrate upon the modern history and politics of China, Japan, and, to some extent, India. Almost all treat the Near and Middle East and southeast Asia only in the most cursory fashion. Two additional institutions are anxious to introduce Far Eastern history courses.

Indiana institutions offer only a few other courses which deal specifically with non-Western areas. Thus, there are two courses on Middle Eastern history and institutions (both customarily taught by natives of the area) five courses on the geography of Asia, four on Russian geography, and three on African geography. One college offers in alternate years either an introduction to Asia and the Soviet Union or an introduction to Africa, courses which touch on geography, history, politics, and culture.

Twenty-five of the colleges surveyed require 2 years of a foreign language for the B.A. degree. However, this statistic is somewhat misleading as an indicator of the number of Indiana undergraduates studying foreign languages, since the foreign language requirement applies only to those students in a liberal arts program. Those preparing for teaching, even in a B.A. program, are generally not required to study a foreign language, and those taking a preprofessional program or working toward a B.S. degree (education, business administration, etc.) also escape this opportunity to obtain insight into a foreign culture. Moreover, students in almost all institutions are allowed to count high school foreign language study as 1 year of credit toward the foreign language requirement. Consequently, less than half the Indiana undergraduates do, in fact, study any modern foreign language.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that very little training in non-Western languages is offered in Indiana colleges and universities. Only 10 of the 34 institutions in the State now offer courses in the Russian language, and 3 of these institutions offer the course on a noncredit basis. Other non-Western languages are available to undergraduates only at Indiana University, which offers courses in Uralic, Turkic, Chinese, and a number of east-central European languages.

While it seems unlikely that the smaller colleges will be able to offer Asian, east-central European, or African languages in the near future, there is considerable interest in introducing the Russian language soon. Two colleges and three Indiana University extension centers began Russian language instruction in the fall of 1958, three other institutions hope to offer Russian by the fall of 1959, and five other institutions expressed a concrete interest in adding Russian in the near future. In most cases, the problem of obtaining teachers qualified to give Russian language courses is a serious one.

In assessing the possibilities for the expansion of Russian language instruction in the Indiana colleges, two factors deserve consideration.

One is mounting student and faculty interest in Russian; the other, the belief of some administrators and instructors that Russian lacks the utility and the cultural significance of Western European languages. Several institutions reported definite expressions of student demand for Russian. These have sometimes taken the form of indirect requests channeled through modern language teachers or faculty members interested in Russian affairs; in several cases, undergraduates have attempted to start informal faculty-student groups for noncredit study of Russian; in 1 instance, 10 students submitted to their dean a formal petition for the introduction of a Russian language course. In colleges in which a significant number of undergraduates plan graduate study, this student interest will undoubtedly be an increasingly important factor in deciding whether to introduce Russian, particularly as more graduate schools recommend Russian as a second language for the doctoral degree.

Extracurricular activity

At a number of institutions, extracurricular activities of various sorts constitute one of the most important and effective ways of exposing students to non-Western cultures. The most common approach is through the chapel meeting, lecture series, or assembly, at which speakers from the institution, outside lecturers, concerts, and films are presented. More than three-quarters of the Indiana colleges and universities have sponsored speakers on some aspect of world affairs within the last 2 years. A dozen of these institutions have arranged at least one meeting which dealt primarily with a non-Western society. In addition, eight institutions have offered film series containing one or more travelogs, documentaries, or commercial movies dealing with a non-Western area.

Sometimes, such extracurricular activity is carefully coordinated with course work; this multiplies the impact and increases student interest. In some colleges, appropriate classes discuss and review the program. Occasionally, outside speakers meet with classes or hold informal faculty-student seminars or discussion groups.

This type of extracurricular activity has the advantage of reaching a large majority of the student body. Moreover, lectures, concerts, and films frequently are open to the public and attract interested persons from the community. At the same time, they are incidental and passing events, a quick injection of information and interest, which, whatever the short-run benefits, may have little lasting influence. Few institutions enable a zealous student to build upon such an introduction to the non-Western World in his course work or in other extracurricular activity.

Another approach, but semicurricular in nature and with a longer and more intensive impact, is the presence for a year, a semester, or even a few weeks of a visiting professor or lecturer who is a specialist on a non-Western area. In addition to public lectures, such individuals may give special courses or seminars for students and faculty or may participate in established courses and seminars. Within the last few years, only a few Indiana institutions have benefited from this type of activity, probably because it is expensive and difficult to arrange. Several years ago Wabash was host to a visiting professor of Chinese philosophy and civilization. Indiana University annually receives visits of 2 weeks' duration from several members of the American Universities field staff, highly trained specialists who engage in study and research abroad for considerable periods of time. These men return to the United States every 18 months to visit the universities cooperating in the AUFS program, where they give lectures and participate in courses and seminars, drawing upon their knowledge and recent experiences in the area of their special interest.

A related extracurricular technique is that of the special faculty or student group, assisted by outside participants. This sometimes takes the form of a faculty seminar meeting throughout the academic year on a particular curricular or substantive problem. In one especially effective case, two neighboring institutions developed a summer workshop for their faculty members. Such activities have been encouraged by the Lilly Foundation and by the faculty workshop program of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. In the latter program, a faculty member, after a summer of intensive study of a particular problem, conducts a faculty seminar during the following academic year.

One institution sponsored a series of "economic dinners" over a 6-week period, open to students, faculty, and interested members of the community. Under this program, which was successful in every way, a panel of four economists from other institutions lectured and led a discussion one night each week. Other schools have tried brief special institutes or seminars on particular problems, with excellent results. Indiana University and the University of Notre Dame in the spring of 1958 began an experiment with a series of lectures by faculty members from the other institution, and plans have been made for intensive credit courses on each other's campus to fill gaps in the established curriculums.

The most common type of extracurricular activity undertaken on student initiative is that connected with international relations clubs or similar organizations. Such groups are active in a majority of the Indiana colleges. In most cases, the clubs sponsor student and faculty forums, panels, and social meetings. Outside speakers are occasionally invited, and special international programs, such as the convocation of a model U.N. assembly for high school students from the surrounding area, are arranged. Inevitably, some students who belong to international relations clubs are interested, or become interested, in non-Western areas.

Most Indiana colleges have a small number of foreign students, many of them from the non-Western World, and the larger universities each have several hundred. These students reportedly have a greater impact upon the community than upon the student body itself. Foreign students are in considerable demand as speakers and guests at Rotary luncheons and club meetings, and many of them evidently represent their countries very effectively. Within the colleges, though, the foreign students appear to be taken somewhat for granted, and, with the exception of occasional close individual friendships with Americans or the sporadic arousing of student curiosity, they do not affect the outlook of the majority of undergraduates. At the same time, foreign students are often active in student groups and clubs, especially international relations clubs, and sometimes they organize cultural programs, dinners, international exhibits or fairs, and other special events at appropriate college ceremonies.

Ten institutions participate in radio-television programing in their communities. In most cases, several of the programs during the year relate to world affairs in some fashion, generally in the form of a panel discussion arranged by a class in the social sciences or by the international relations club, with both American and foreign students participating. These programs, which occasionally deal with the non-Western World, seem to meet a favorable response, and there is probably considerable unexploited potential in this type of activity, both for arousing student interest in non-Western areas and for informing a segment of the public.

Teaching materials and the library

Teaching materials for instruction concerning non-Western areas are a major problem. Libraries and instructors need textbooks, written for the undergraduate, which put non-Western areas into greater prominence and better perspective, source materials and readings in an inexpensive format, and journals on non-Western areas of a less scholarly and more popular nature than most current ones. Many instructors now rely upon current newspapers, periodicals, and pamphlets for illustrative and supplementary material, particularly concerning recent or contemporary developments. Few make adequate use of films and television as teaching aids.

Most libraries (excluding those in the large universities) have almost no non-Western language materials, very few books in Western foreign languages on the non-Western areas, and only a few periodicals which deal with these areas. Moreover, their holdings in English on non-Western areas are limited and uneven; coverage of areas and subjects is spotty, and the materials vary widely in quality. Most libraries subscribe to one or two journals on international politics and world affairs, such as Foreign Affairs and World Politics, and to one or two distinguished newspapers. Outside of the large university libraries, only a few possess such journals as the Far Eastern Survey and Problems of Communism; one or two carry the Middle East Journal and the English-language magazine issued by the Soviet Government, USSR; only three subscribe to the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, an invaluable teaching aid for undergraduate courses touching on recent and contemporary Soviet affairs. Only three or four libraries purchase scholarly journals such as the American Slavic and East European Review and the Journal of Asian Studies.

Achievements and shortcomings

The principal achievements with regard to education concerning the non-Western areas are, by nature, difficult to define because they reside in the spirit of education and in the atmosphere of the campus. Fundamentally, during the last decade or two, the horizons of Indiana colleges and of their students have stretched. While much remains to be done, given the magnitude of the problem and the conservative character of educational institutions, very considerable progress has been made in adding new courses, in introducing new languages and techniques of language instruction, in injecting into the curriculums and into the climate of education a new approach toward the rest of the world, in utilizing extracurricular methods effectively, and in absorbing into the college community men and women from other parts of the world.

Some institutions have inevitably progressed more than others. The two largest universities with a liberal arts foundation, Indiana and

Notre Dame, have developed impressive graduate programs on non-Western areas. However, undergraduate instruction in both of these institutions has, thus far, been remarkably little affected by these additions, and these universities must erect a bridge from their graduate programs and research into the undergraduate student body. Purdue University in the last decade has expanded foreign language instruction and has enlarged the impact of the social sciences and humanities upon its technical students. A number of the smaller institutions have become much concerned with the problem of exposing the undergraduate to the non-Western World, and are developing promising new approaches to this problem. Earlham College, for example, is in the process of working out with Antioch College a cooperative arrangement for a basic course on the Far East as a means of acquainting its students with at least one major non-Western area. This basic course will, it is hoped, be included among those courses meeting the distribution requirement in the social sciences so that it may become a part of the educational experience of a substantial number of Earlham undergraduates. In addition, each college will offer one advanced course to permit interested students to learn about the area in somewhat greater depth.

Most Indiana administrators and instructors agree that undergraduates need to know more concerning non-Western civilizations. Sixteen, or approximately half, of the Indiana colleges have demonstrated sufficient interest in improving their curricula so far as the non-Western areas are concerned as to seek to add instructors and courses. Nine colleges have a mild though definite interest, but will obviously need outside encouragement. Seven are interested but passive, and leaders in but two institutions doubt that the study of non-Western areas is important or that they should increase their efforts in this regard.

Present interest in non-Western areas on the part of Indiana colleges and universities is focused on the Far East and Russia, with little in south Asia, and the Middle East and almost none concerning southeast Asia, Africa, and east central Europe, except as the latter is considered a part of the Soviet orbit. Moreover, interest in Russia is increasing at a more rapid rate than that in other areas, undoubtedly because of the events of the last year or two, particularly the launching of the Soviet satellites. More institutions are planning the addition of Russian language instruction and Russian history courses than are planning courses in other area fields.

In other institutions with clear interests or considerable achievements in instruction concerning non-Western areas, one or two members of the faculty or administration are usually responsible. Such men are generally leaders within their institutions, and they clearly represent one of the most important resources for improving undergraduate instruction on the non-Western World. They are more significant than funds, materials, or special programs. They provide the indispensable initiative and leadership; they need only advice and support.

Most colleges have been distressingly slow in bringing the fruits of modern technology into the educational process. Many are working with 19th-century practices and equipment, and few make effective use of new methods and techniques, from audiovisual materials and devices to television. The new generation of teachers is generally not being trained to use modern aids in the classroom. Only three institutions in the State have modern language laboratories, and only two others have even makeshift or experimental laboratories. Indiana libraries often ignore large parts of the world, and the undergraduate in many Indiana institutions would not be able to find one readable and informative book on some areas of the world, even if he were interested.

Moreover, the various institutions in the State have not fully utilized available opportunities for a cooperative attack on the new problems which face them. Faculty members competent on non-Western areas or language might be shared by neighboring institutions; other cooperative arrangements also seem to promise mutual benefits. Yet joint appointments seldom exist, even when institutions are only a few blocks or miles apart. Only rarely are visiting lecturers shared, and an experience in one institution is infrequently passed on to another.

In general, Indiana colleges and universities, as all institutions of higher learning in America, have been scrambling desperately, but often unsuccessfully, to have the education and inspiration they impart somehow reflect the changes which affect the world in this most revolutionary of ages. Most administrators recognize the problems; most realize that education must preserve the best, instruct concerning our own society and create a synthesis of the past and the present, of the old and the new. However, few have acted with the deliberate speed necessary to prepare our students for life in the 2d half of the 20th century. So far as non-Western areas are concerned, this is especially true of the technical schools and of the professional schools or curriculums in all the Indiana institutions. In other words, most institutions must make an immense, organized effort to meet this revolutionary challenge, or provide an education unworthy of their students and the times.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

General

Such is the situation in undergraduate education in Indiana. To those who are concerned over how well our youth are being prepared for responsible citizenship in the world of 1980—a world in which Russia, China, and all of Asia and Africa will be playing prominent roles, with their actions daily affecting the vital interests of the United States—the picture is a disturbing one. It is clear that the average Indiana undergraduate today receives an education so highly oriented toward Western civilization that he emerges from college with little understanding of or interest in world affairs or other cultures. The boundaries of his knowledge and interest resemble those which Santayana defined as "respectability and Christendom." We believe that this is the case in other states as well: Indiana curriculums are not notably different, Indiana instructors come from every State in the Union, the textbooks and other materials used are also used in other States, and the Indiana record on foreign language instruction, while below the national average, is not an unusual one.

If this situation is to be changed, what are the major problems to be overcome and what lines of action can be followed? Fundamental is the need to recast and reorient our whole educational effort, from kindergarten to Ph. D. In this spectrum, the undergraduate years are vital. Alumni, administrators, and faculty of American colleges must recognize that traditional educational requirements fall short of meeting the needs of the 20th century world, that knowledge of Western culture alone will not suffice for the citizen of tomorrow, and that liberal education in its best sense must be universal in outlook, drawing on the values, experience, and aspirations of all peoples and cultures. It is not farfetched to imagine the day when the study of non-Western societies will be regarded, not as something unusual and exotic, requiring special interests and extraordinary resources, but as part of the normal activity of the social science and humanities departments of every college and university in the country. The time may also come when some knowledge of non-Western peoples and civilizations will be accepted as part of the customary intellectual baggage which should accompany every American undergraduate as he leaves the campus.

Such a broad rethinking of our educational emphases is, of course, a difficult task. It will not be accomplished overnight. Moreover, as all involved in education understand, the nature of man, of academic man in particular, assumes as much significance in this problem as the subject and the material. Educational systems are among the most conservative structures in existence. This report was, therefore, prepared and written in the same combination of hope and despair which led one college president to compare changing the curriculum to moving a cemetery.

There are good grounds for optimism, however. The objectives of an educational system only mirror the values of the society of which it is a part. Today, Americans as a whole are more "worldminded" than they have ever been; the events of the last two decades have forced upon our consciousness the existence and importance of the non-Western world. Moreover, and most encouragingly, the attitudes and climate within educational institutions are changing rapidly. Students are eager to learn about areas and peoples which they sense will someday significantly affect their own interests. Faculty are inquisitive and are reaching out for new data and new ideas by which to test old assumptions based almost solely on Western experience. Most administrators are aware of the immense new challenges which have arisen at the very moment when practical issues of the most compelling kind face every educational institution. As President Robert F. Goheen of Princeton University pointed out in his annual report for 1958, American universities and colleges, after "some two and a half centuries of academic preoccupation with the Western World—to the neglect of the Orient, when not to its exclusion—" must now learn "to educate our citizenry effectively as regards the non-European world, with all of its vast requirements and the telling influence it is likely to have in the future course of this century."

At the same time, institutions of higher education vary widely in the effectiveness with which they are changing their curriculums and the climate of their campuses in an effort to keep abreast of world changes and of America's new international role. Some colleges are making extraordinary progress; others are providing fundamentally the same kind of education they did 20 years ago, quite unaffected by the revolutionary developments of the intervening years. There are vast differences even within individual colleges and universities, with some schools and departments living in great contentment behind high walls of isolation, while others bustle with energy and imagination in an effort to adapt to the startling changes on the world scene and in the sciences.

It is clear, however, that all our colleges live in a different climate than existed 20 years ago. Television, radio, newspapers, and magazines provide information and an atmosphere concerning the rest of the world completely unlike that of a generation ago, and institutions whose faculty members were distributed throughout the world by war and cold war have gradually changed character and outlook. This is reflected in the vigor and vitality of the interest expressed in non-Western areas and the eagerness with which individuals and groups actively seek to improve the quality of instruction in this regard. These factors are difficult to define and to measure, but they constitute the liveliest hope for the future.

But a change of attitude and outlook is not enough. A growing number of educators recognize the importance of acquainting undergraduates with the non-Western areas, but many of them believe that this objective has to be neglected, or at best given a low priority, until students know better their own history and culture. They are concerned that there is simply not enough time in 4 crowded undergraduate years to inform a student adequately concerning both the Western and non-Western worlds. Moreover, others, deeply interested in instruction regarding non-Western areas, are hampered by practical problems, particularly those of course and curriculum reorganization and those connected with finding and paying for additional facutly and library materials.

The remaining pages of this paper are therefore devoted to a discussion of various practical measures that may be taken to increase the attention devoted to non-Western cultures in an undergraduate institution. These suggestions are based on the ideas of the Indiana presidents, deans, and faculty interviewed and on the discussion of this problem at the conference held at Indiana University in September 1958. In most cases, the steps outlined here involve little, if any, reduction or dilution of education concerning the Western World, which has been the colleges' chief concern.

These suggestions certainly do not exhaust the possibilities for action, but are those considered useful and immediately feasible for most colleges. Moreover, these are, in most instances, procedures which can be adopted at once and at little cost. Clearly, not all these courses of action are applicable to every institution; each college will want to select those most suited to its needs.

Guidance and assistance

In the first place, even with the best of intentions, it is difficult for administrators and faculty concerned with this problem to undertake to resolve it entirely on their own. Often, they are not informed concerning the experience of other institutions, from which they might profit. They do not know where to turn for guidance concerning puzzling questions connected with the curriculum and with the acquisition of books and teachers. Under these circumstances, it is clear that many eductaors would welcome and be helped by advice and assistance from area specialists and from other college teachers and administrators concerned with undergraduate education relating to non-Western areas. This assistance might come from a graduate area center or from groups of area specialists. For example, the survey revealed that Indiana colleges would welcome guidance and aid concerning instruction in non-Western areas from Indiana University or from a State, regional, or national organization of specialists established for this purpose. Indeed, State or regional centers for each non-Western area could provide most useful guidance for those seeking to improve undergraduate education.

Over the next few years, the area specialists will undoubtedly develop specific mechanisms for the purpose of assisting and advising colleges interested in this question; in the field of Asian studies, the Asia Society, with headquarters in New York, already performs such functions, making available information on undergraduate programs of Asian studies, distributing lists of appropriate books and films, organizing traveling cultural and art exhibits, and helping to arrange consulting services on the problems involved in introducing Asian studies. In the interim, any college which wishes to secure help and guidance for improving the position of non-Western studies in its curriculum will find a sympathetic response from area centers in neighboring universities.

Plans will also undoubtedly be devised to permit teachers and administrators interested in instruction concerning non-Western areas to meet with area specialists on a regional basis every few years. Such conferences could either concentrate on the problems and opportunities involved in courses on non-Western areas, or might deal with substantive issues concerning given areas. These conferences would stimulate college teachers, educate specialists concerning the needs and the achievements of undergraduate instruction, and in general bridge the gap which separates the university and the college, the specialist and the teacher. Indeed, high school teachers should also participate in these conferences, because the educational process is a continuum, and no one part can be repaired if all parts are not in good order and close cooperation.

The curriculum

The most urgent problem is to determine how to expose all, or practically all, undergraduates to the non-Western world in some form. When the question of enlarging the role of non-Western studies is raised, some educators think immediately of the addition of specialized courses on the history, government, economy, or literature of given areas. In fact, such advanced courses in particular disciplines, while representing an important complementary approach to the problem, are usually elected by only a few junior and senior students and consequently reach only a small proportion of the student body.

An essential step therefore is to increase the attention devoted to non-Western areas in basic general courses in the social sciences and humanities, which are required of a large number of students at the freshman and sophomore level. These are sometimes called "general education" courses and sometimes bear disciplinary designations, such as world history, introductory geography, world literature, or principles of economics. This increase in attention may be achieved by some reorganization of course content or by the introduction of comparative and illustrative material from non-Western areas. Recasting such basic courses may be achieved by providing a faculty member with free time, perhaps with outside financial support, to revise a given course, to develop a new syllabus and readings, and to prepare necessary new materials pertaining to non-Western areas.

An alternative approach is the development of an interdepartmental introductory or civilization course on a non-Western culture, such as the one on the Far East being planned at Earlham and Antioch, to match the traditional course devoted to a survey of European history or Western civilization. It is essential that such a course occupy a position in the curriculum or the college requirements that will insure enrollment of a majority of the freshman or sophomore students. The planning and introduction of this type of course inevitably involve substantial problems relating to personnel, materials, departmental organization, and finances, but, here again, advise and assistance from those with experience in these matters would be most useful.

Steps to increase the non-Western content of undergraduate education can also be taken at the upper division or junior and senior level. More non-Western materials can be introduced into existing comparative courses, such as comparative government, comparative economic systems, international relations, and comparative religion, or such courses can be initiated. Finally, some institutions may find it possible to introduce special disciplinary courses devoted to parts of the non-Western world, such as the geography of Asia, Russian history, or Soviet economic development.

Language instruction

It seems unlikely that the average college will be able to offer instruction in the languages of Asia and Africa in the immediate future. Opportunities for interested undergraduates to study these languages will undoubtedly be made available through summer programs at major university area and language centers, particularly with the assistance provided under title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which is specifically designed to promote American knowledge of the "unusual" languages.

However, a number of colleges should be in a position to offer Russian language instruction in the course of the next decade. Russian is easier to teach and to learn than most Asian and African languages, and it is rapidly rivaling German and French in importance as a language of science. Knowledge of Russian permits direct access to the great literary and cultural heritage of Russian civilization and also has utilitarian value for the growing number of Americans who have contact with the Soviet world—government officials, scholars, journalists, artists, students, and ordinary tourists. Most graduate schools now accept Russian as one of the languages meeting requirements for a doctoral degree, and some science departments strongly recommend Russian for graduate work. In the teaching of Russian, modern methods of language instruction should be employed, and students should begin the study of Russian and other European languages as early as possible in their educational careers.

Faculty resources

Adding interested and qualified teachers is a major hurdle in the development of non-Western studies in undergraduate education. However, the expected mushrooming of student enrollment should provide a unique opportunity for the addition of area-trained teachers to college staffs. In the normal replacement and expansion of faculty, colleges will be able to appoint good teachers with a double competence—sound training in a discipline combined with area specialization or, in the case of language teachers, German or French, as well as Russian. Such individuals can carry their share of teaching in the basic disciplinary courses or in the customary languages, while at the same time broadening and enriching the curriculum through their knowledge of a particular non-Western area or language.

It is admittedly difficult at present for the college administrator to identify and attract teachers with this sort of dual capability. Once again, however, an organization providing guidance and help concerning instruction on the non-Western areas, or the areas centers themselves, could be of assistance.

Moreover, graduate schools must to some degree reorient graduate education. In many cases, graduate schools are still producing students almost exclusively oriented toward Western institutions and culture, students so highly trained on non-Western areas that they cannot teach other courses effectively, or specialists so highly trained on non-Western areas that they lack the competence for effective teaching in basic courses. A heavy share of the responsibility for encouraging greater attention to non-Western areas in undergraduate education lies with the graduate schools and their respective discipline departments, which must provide a different kind of product, particularly men and women with strong training in their discipline and sound knowledge concerning at least one non-Western area.

The major universities and their specialists can contribute substantially to progress in undergraduate education in still another way—by recognizing the shortage of teaching materials and by changing their values for prestige and promotion. Thus, senior scholars should be encouraged to write textbooks for basic general courses in the disciplines which devote increased attention to the non-Western world and to prepare and publish texts and other teaching materials on individual areas. This would be of enormous assistance to the undergraduate teacher, handicapped now by the shortage or absence of such materials.

In meeting the need for teachers prepared to instruct concerning non-Western areas in the colleges, existing faculty resources, as well as new appointments, can be utilized. A number of undergraduate institutions have teachers keenly interested in presenting courses dealing with non-Western areas or languages. A fellowship program to enable such teachers to obtain additional training on the area or its languages at a major university center for a period ranging from one or two summers to 15 months would constitute an important step in expanding faculty resources on the non-Western areas. At the center, the instructor would audit and observe courses, collect reading lists, attend seminars, discuss instructional problems with specialists and other teachers, and obtain knowledge and stimulation for his own teaching. Such a program would be easy to arrange for a summer, and members of several departments at Indiana University are already planning summer school programs especially designed for this purpose and for "refreshing" instructors who received training and experience in non-Western areas some years ago. In 1958–59, the Center for East Asian Studies at Harvard University inaugurated a fellowship program under which liberal arts colleges and the center cooperate in providing a year's study at Harvard for undergraduate teachers interested in improving instruction concerning the east Asian area in their institutions.

While arrangements to release a teacher for additional training in a non-Western area have to be worked out carefully between the college and the sponsoring center, there are no insurmountable obstacles. Many institutions are willing to share the expenses involved, although in most cases fellowship aid would probably also be required. In some instances, faculty members might take advantage of sabbatical and other established leave arrangements. In the Indiana colleges alone, a half a dozen or more able and interested candidates for such a program were found, surely a fine sign for the future. As noted previously, another group of teachers could effectively use leave, probably on their own campuses, to revise their basic courses and to add new materials concerning non-Western areas to established general courses. Faculty travel and faculty exchanges, sometimes privately sponsored, sometimes under Government auspices, represent still another significant avenue for extending teaching resources on the non-Western areas.

Finally, cooperative arrangements among neighboring institutions are an important way to multiply the offerings and capabilities of colleges interested in non-Western studies. Such arrangements hold particular promise in the language field. In cases where institutions are very close, students might take classes at the other college, or faculty might be shared. Another possibility that remains to be fully explored is beaming TV courses on non-Western areas from one institution to a number of institutions, a program which Indiana University will launch with several colleges in the spring of 1959 with a course on modern Russian history. Cooperation among faculty members and in course offerings of the kind being contemplated by Earlham and Antioch, and by Indiana University and Notre Dame, should be considered. Moreover, in expanding their work on non-Western areas, colleges should endeavor to complement rather than duplicate the resources of neighboring institutions. Cooperative efforts of all kinds can, of course, embrace library materials, as well as courses and faculty.

Extracurricular activity

The realm of extracurricular and semicurricular activity offers a wide range of possibilities. Special efforts can insure increased attention to the non-Western world in chapel and assembly programs, in lecture and film series, in panels and forums, in debates, in the work of international relations clubs and similar groups, in exhibits and festivals, and in radio-TV programing sponsored by the college. A number of opportunities exist for enlisting the interest and cooperation of groups in the community. In addition, assistance and advice can often be obtained from such national organizations in the foreign affairs field as the Foreign Policy Association, the Council on Foreign Relations, and regional councils on world affairs. The role of the foreign student in the college community can be made more meaningful. Student travel and exchanges have always represented an excellent method for interesting and informing undergraduates concerning the non-Western world.

Finally, there is great potential in the development, through cooperation between the colleges and the area centers, of a system of visiting seminars or workshops, bringing individual specialists or groups of area specialists to a campus for intensive discussion of an area with both faculty and students. These specialists might be distinguished scholars; they might also be lively young men, still in graduate school or just beginning their careers, who have completed a period of study in their area of special concern and who can bring the particular insights of young men and women to undergraduate student bodies. Such a program might consist of six or eight weekly meetings or a continuous 3-day session; it would involve community participation, visits to appropriate classes, meetings with interested groups, and seminars or discussions with faculty members. While the effect of such brief "institutes" might not be lasting, the immediate impact on both the college and the community would undoubtedly be enormous and the long-range result would almost certainly be much increased faculty and student effort and interest concerning the study of non-Western areas.

Teaching materials and the library

As noted earlier, there is an urgent need for textbooks and other materials for the undergraduate which give sufficient attention to the non-Western world, a need which can be adequately met only if the academic profession and university administrators begin to recognize the importance of, and give due credit for, the preparation of such materials by competent scholars in the various area fields. At the same time, publishers can do much to assist by encouraging and supporting the writing of textbooks and the compiling of source books which contain substantial material on the non-Western world.

In the library field, a most important and immediately useful step would be the preparation of a critical bibliography on the non-Western areas, providing the kind of information an instructor or librarian needs to help him identify the significant books. An area specialist, or a committee of area specialists, in whose judgment the colleges would have confidence, might select and evaluate lists of books and periodicals on non-Western areas. Two types of lists are needed: one, issued once but revised periodically, would describe a basic collection for each area; the other, issued annually, would analyze the most important works on each area published within the preceding year. The former list would permit a library to check its present holdings and to begin an acquisition program designed to obtain the most fundamental and useful books on the non-Western areas. The latter would assist a library in continuing to build a first-rate small collection and in expanding its monies for current acquisitions wisely.

Finally, the potential of various audiovisual and other technical aids remains to be fully exploited. Instruction concerning the non-Western areas would benefit greatly from improved materials of this sort and from a greater realization on the part of teachers of the utility and value of such teaching aids.

In conclusion, we should like to emphasize our conviction, buttressed by achievements in a number of institutions, that very considerable progress in instruction concerning the non-Western areas can be made by any college at little cost. Because the problem is such an important and seemingly formidable one, some college educators may assume that its resolution is beyond their reach. In fact, however, any college can make a start, drawing upon the suggestions advanced in this paper and on others which are bound to occur to alert faculty and administrators. A major change, even a revolution, in an institution's approach to this problem can be attained in a number of ways, many of which involve little expense or dislocation. With interest and determination, American students can be made aware of the problems and potentialities of the non-Western world and prepared to live in the age which lies ahead. ("Russian and Other Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education," The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana)

THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF INDIANA

Anderson College (Church of God).
Ball State Teachers College.
Butler University (Disciples of Christ association).
Concordia Senior College (Lutheran-Missouri Synod).
DePauw University (Methodist association).
Earlham College (Society of Friends).
Evansville College (Methodist association).
Frankin College (Baptist).
Goshen College (Mennonite).
Grace Theological Seminary and College (Grace Brethren).
Hanover College (Presbyterian association).
Huntington College (Church of United Brethren).
Indiana Central College (Evangelical United Brethren).
Indiana State Teachers College.
Indiana Technical College.
Indiana University.
    Indiana University Extension Centers
        Calumet-East Chicago.
        Evansville (with Evansville College).
        Fort Wayne.
        Gary.
        Indianapolis.
        Jeffersonville-New Albany.
        Kokomo.
        Richmond (with Earlham College).
        South Bend-Mishawaka.
        Vincennes (with Vincennes University).
Manchester College (Church of Brethren).
Marian College (Catholic).
Marion College (Wesleyan Methodist).
Oakland City College (Baptist).
Purdue University.
    Purdue University Extension Centers
        Columbus.
        Fort Wayne.
        Hammond.
        Indianapolis.
        Michigan City.
Rose Polytechnic Institute.
St. Francis College (Catholic).
St. Joseph's College (Catholic).
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College (Catholic).
St. Mary's College (Catholic).

St. Meinrad's Seminary (Catholic).
Taylor University (Methodist association).
Tri-State College.
University of Notre Dame (Catholic).
Valparaiso University (Lutheran).
Vincennes University (junior college).
Wabash College.
West Baden College (Catholic).

Asian Studies for Undergraduates

*by William Theodore de Bary**

Mr. de Bary is director of the Columbia College Oriental Studies Program, Columbia University.

In discussing Asian studies for undergraduates, two points can perhaps be agreed upon to start with. No one, I should think, presumes that he has found exactly the right formula for introducing Asian studies to undergraduates. Circumstances differ so greatly from one college to another—the nature of the student body, the qualifications of the instructors, the time and resources available—that inevitably a wide variety of means will be employed to achieve the same end, and no two courses will be exactly alike. Granted that every educational situation is in a sense unique, certain common purposes motivate the teaching of Asian studies, and certain criteria exist by which to judge success.

Recently I had the pleasure of reading a statement by John Fairbank entitled "East Asia in General Education: Philosophy and Practice," and I was struck by the fact that many of the criteria advanced in his paper for the proper conduct of such a course corresponded to those we try to adhere to at Columbia. Nevertheless, I was made even more aware of some basic differences in approach which derive from the kind of liberal education or general education which Columbia College has been engaged in for several decades now—since the early twenties. The fact is, our oriental studies program at Columbia is really less a response to the spectacular interest in Asia which sprang up after the Second World War than it is an outgrowth of a well-established program of liberal education, of which it was hoped almost from the beginning that the oriental traditions should form a part, along with the Western.

The significance of this is twofold. First, in contrast to many colleges today where specialists on Asia have been struggling to win a place in the curriculum, at Columbia it was the college faculty that came to the specialists and asked for courses in oriental civilizations which would fit into the general education program. Second, at the time this movement gained momentum, just before and after the Second World War, there were already numerous elementary or introductory courses available to undergraduates which dealt with one or another aspect of oriental civilizations: for example, Chinese history, language, literature, or art; the same for Japanese, and so on. The trouble was that only a few undergraduates, whose interests ran along special lines, were attracted to such courses, while the great majority, finding their programs heavily crowded with preprofessional requirements, regarded these courses as luxuries they could not afford, or rather as luxuries they could afford to dispense with since they seemed in no way vital to general intellectual maturity.

---

*© 1959, Ohio State University Press.

Consequently, the particular need felt in 1946 was for broader courses which would introduce the nonspecialist—the premedical, preengineering, prelaw students, and not just the humanities or social science majors—to the most general features of the major oriental civilizations. These new courses at Columbia were to be modeled as closely as possible on the existing general education courses for freshmen, Contemporary Civilization in the West and the Humanities (that is, the great books of the Western tradition). They were to serve the purposes of liberal education, not merely constitute an introduction to foreign area studies. I stress this distinction because of the widespread tendency today to lump the two together. Actually, many, if not most, of the undergraduate area studies being added to college curriculums today simply make it possible for more students to become area specialists earlier. They are not really conceived as part of the liberal education which anyone—even the prospective nuclear physicist—should get in college.

Space does not permit me to enter into the philosophy behind the two courses which served as our models, but the basic distinction between them must be made clear. The Contemporary Civilization course has sought to answer these questions: "How have men made a living? How have they lived together? How have they interpreted the world they have lived in?"[1] Though CC (as we call it) draws upon materials from several of the social science disciplines in answering these questions, it is in no sense a piecing together of snatches from, or lectures upon, different subject matters. Always, the kind of integration has been striven for which would help the student to realize that in human affairs, which defy strict compartmentalization, the several disciplines are an aid only insofar as they illuminate, rather than dissect or amputate, the living reality. For this reason the approach in CC has been from the start frankly historical. As J. H. Randall has put it:

> For underclassmen, perhaps the easiest way to treat subjects liberally is to teach them historically * * *. History when liberally conceived [as Santayana says] has the function either of politics or of poetry. It is political, in bringing the past to a focus upon our problems, in illuminating the choices which it is ours to make, in making clear why we must face them, and in helping us to understand the materials with which we must work. History best performs its function as politics when it is functioning as poetry, as a revelation of man—and of what human nature has been and has become * * *.[2]

As applied to the oriental traditions, this approach has special significance. There are many persons today who explain the need for Asian studies in terms of the rising importance of Asian peoples in the world today, of their crucial role in the East-West struggle, and of the necessity for Asian-American understanding as the basis of an effective foreign policy. There is no question but that such considerations are vital in the political, diplomatic, and military arena today, but there is a very real question whether they have anything to do with liberal education. The peoples and civilizations of Asia are important to undergraduate education, not because they represent factors in the cold war, as means to some immediate practical end, but because their experience in living together, what they have learned

---

[1] Justus Buchler, "Reconstruction in the Liberal Arts," *A History of Columbia College on Morningside* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), p. 102.

[2] John H. Randall, Jr., "Which Are the Liberating Arts?" *American Scholar*, XIII (April 1944), pp. 147–48.

about life, and what they have come to understand about the universe we all live in is now part of the common human heritage. Nor are these peoples to be studied like problem children needing our help. They are to be studied, rather, as peoples who can teach us much about ourselves, whose past can give us a new perspective on our own, and whose way of looking at things can challenge us to a reexamination of our own.

To accomplish the purposes of the CC course, source readings have been used for many years as the main texts, as the "central avenue by which students were to examine 'the development of Western institutions and ideas.' "[3] So greatly did these source readings add to the depth and excitement, to the sense of immediacy, with which students came into contact with the drama of human experience that it became one of our primary aims in developing a course on oriental civilizations to provide source readings which would stimulate the student's imagination and thinking processes in a similar manner. Yet it was precisely in this connection that we could expect the least help from the traditional disciplines of oriental study. Here the compartments were well established. The study of thought was largely confined to religion and philosophy and to the classical periods. The study of institutions was relatively new, and the relation between thought and institutions hardly examined at all. Nevertheless, with the support of the Carnegie Corp. and the collaboration of colleagues elsewhere in Asia and the West, in the last several years we have been able to prepare materials which come at least reasonably close to meeting our needs.

If, however, we were to approach the subject matter on the level of both intellectual and institutional history, it was obvious that there would have to be severe limitations on the scope of the course. To cover Asia as a whole was certainly out of the question. Only by concentrating upon the major civilizations—those to which even the peripheral areas of Asia had looked for much of their culture—and upon the major traditions—those which had sustained intellectual activity on a level that might sufficiently challenge the student coming from a study of the Western tradition—could we keep the course from becoming a mere survey. Accordingly, we decided to restrict ourselves to China, Japan, India, and Pakistan. In these relatively well-defined areas we would have an opportunity to examine the pervasive problems of the ancient agrarian civilizations, the economic relationships, social arrangements, and political institutions which contributed so much to the stability and durability of the most mature oriental civilizations, and then to see these alongside the comparatively younger, more dynamic, and less stable society of Japan. We would have an opportunity also to study the historical role of the major religious and philosophical traditions—Hindu, Buddhist, Islamic, and Confucianist—as well as those lesser ones—Jain, Taoist, and Shintoist, for instance—which help to underline both the unity and diversity of national traditions, and the richness of oriental thought in general. As a stimulus to the student's own active confrontation of the problems found in these social situations and the ideas embodied in these traditions, this choice of areas has the advantage of offering the historical confrontation of these traditions with

---

[3] Buchler, op. cit., p. 106.

each other on common ground—in India, Buddhism and Hinduism, Islam and Hinduism; in China, Buddhism and Confucianism; in Japan, both of these with each other and with Shinto. There is the advantage, too, that when the student encounters Buddhism in China and Japan, he has already been introduced to it in the land of its origin; he follows its own path of historical evolution, instead of seeing it as a brief intrusion upon Chinese and Japanese history. Indeed, he appreciates the significance of this later development all the more for having seen the fate of Buddhism in India. Similarly, he is familiar with Confucianism as a tradition closely associated with the civil bureaucracy of China, administering a vast and populous empire, before he examines the history of these same ideas and institutions as transplanted to the very different soil of aristocratic, feudal Japan. On the other hand, in the modern period he may see some of these tendencies and problems reversed, as Meiji Japan, more compact and mobile than her great neighbor, for a time sets the pace and even the example—perhaps similarly inappropriate—for sprawling China in the adoption of Western methods, ideas, and institutions.

It is always difficult for us to see a civilization whole, all by itself. We do not even begin to understand ourselves and our own society, though we spend a lifetime at it, until we come into contact with others; and then suddenly the significance of things we have been immersed in, surrounded with, breaks in upon us. Students experience this same feeling repeatedly as, in their minds, they "live" with one civilization for a time and then move on to encounter another. The question is, of course, how far and how fast they can move without simply getting giddy, without losing all touch with realities. For this reason we have tried to avoid a purely topical arrangement of the subject matter, which would involve skipping back and forth from one civilization to another. In our first semester we take up the traditional civilizations of India, China, and Japan separately and in that order. Indeed, we discourage the making of any comparative judgments until the year is well along and the student has some understanding of each civilization as a living, growing thing. In the second semester the order is not quite so neat. Modern India is presented first, since Western power and influence were exerted there first and most fully. But then Meiji Japan is taken up, as the first example of resurgent nationalism and modernization in Asia, before examining the long process of disintegration in the Manchu empire and the unsuccessful efforts to reconstitute a stable social and political order before the outbreak of full hostilities between China and Japan in 1937. At this point we turn back to Japan, to the struggle between divergent forces in Japanese national life from the First World War to the present. Finally, we take up the collapse of Nationalist China and Chinese communism.

We do not feel strongly attached or committed to this particular sequence of chronological periods, and our source readings, which are bound in separate volumes for India, China, and Japan, would be adaptable to other schemes of presentation. The important thing for us is that within a general chronological sequence we be able to take up broad movements or broad topics of significance to the development of the civilization as a whole rather than feel obliged to study every aspect of every period. In other words, we try to strike a balance between topical presentation and chronological development, as in some way I am sure almost everyone tries to do. Whether our approach is the best that can be worked out, even granting our general principles, is a question that I have continued to ask myself and the students. From their responses I should say that at least two main points have emerged. That is, no matter how much the students may ask for more of this and less of that (and one thing they almost always want less of is long reading assignments), when the question is put to them whether or not it would be better to separate the study of India and Pakistan from that of China and Japan, or south Asia from east Asia (which might make life simpler and easier for them), they are unanimous, year after year, in asking that the two be kept together. And, similarly, when asked if they would prefer a purely topical presentation, cutting across all time periods and perhaps even across national and cultural borders, they are again unanimous in their support of the present historical sequence of topics. These may represent only the prejudices of students acquired from their previous general education courses, but at least they seem to be the basic facts we have to work with at Columbia.

Now I should like to deal briefly with the other of the two courses I mentioned at the outset, the oriental humanities. This involves the reading and discussion, in colloquium form, of great works of literature, philosophy, and religion from the Near East, India, China, and Japan. In addition to canonical texts like the Koran, the Upanishads, the Bhagavad-Gita, Shankara, the Analects, and so on, we take up a wide variety of plays, poetry, novels, and some art forms for which there are no direct counterparts in Western literature. The basic principle in the oriental humanities, as distinguished from the civilization course, is that these works are considered primarily, not for their historical importance, but for their intrinsic value to man in any place or time. This is not to say that historical factors can be completely dispensed with in understanding such texts, or that we would not prefer our humanities students to have been exposed to the civilization course beforehand. The underlying idea is that certain products of the human imagination are worth understanding and assimilating for what they are in themselves, for the human values they give expression to. They are to be regarded (if I may quote in part from a latter-day exponent of this idea at Columbia) "as embodying experiences that are recurrent or inevitable; as awakening or clarifying universal emotions; as offering what is intrinsically worthy of contemplation; as forcing the translation of older standards into newer ones; as inspiring the senses and the intellect."[4]

Now there is no question but that many works from the oriental traditions answer to this description, as we know from the response of our own students to them and from the fact that they are finding a place for themselves in paperback editions in drugstores and train stations. Today we do not have to argue that such classics have at least as much to offer the modern reader as the current bestsellers, the way Raymond Weaver, one of the great teachers of the Western humanities at Columbia, had to when asked by a lady at a dinner party whether he had read *Gone With the Wind*, which he hadn't. "You ought to," she said, "it's been out 6 months." "Have you read the *Divine Comedy?*" he

---

[4] Buchler, op. cit., p. 122.

asked. "No," she answered. "Well, you ought to; it's been out 600 years."

The question may be raised, however, whether it is possible for students to read and grasp 30 or 40 Oriental classics in 1 year. Their cultural content, their original languages, their ways of thought are so different from our own that a full understanding of them can only be gotten by prolonged and intensive study. Now, leaving aside the problem of whether anyone, even the most thorough specialist, can ever be said fully to have understood any of these works, we must certainly admit that it is possible by more intensive study to get a better grasp of these books than the student gets in the humanities course. Still, this is no reason for denying the great majority of students, who cannot afford such intensive study, that measure of benefit which derives from reading them at least once. If they have inquiring minds at all, they are going to attempt this anyhow, and those who are concerned that students not misunderstand these works should certainly try to provide them with an opportunity to make the first reading of the texts both an appreciative and a critical one. At Columbia we try to do this by taking up the works in a colloquium discussion guided by two instructors, one a specialist in the literature dealt with, and the other, when possible, a teacher drawn from another discipline whose background is in the Western humanities. The function of the latter is both to help the student relate what he learns to relevant aspects of the Western tradition and to ensure that the discussion is maintained on a general level so that the specialist does not drag the conversation off into bypaths most familiar to him personally. There is also the incidental advantage of this arrangement that it introduces some of the rest of the faculty, as well as the students, to these books for the first time. This, of course, is something which cannot very well be done by the civilization course, which, being more historical and factual in content, is less susceptible of such general treatment.

At present the oriental civilization and the oriental humanities courses are not part of the required general education program at Columbia but are taken on an elective basis, mostly by juniors and seniors. Since Columbia College likes to restrict class sections to around 25 or 30 students, and the colloquia to 15 (that is, it tries to avoid packing hundreds of students into a lecture room for something like a chautauqua series), offering these courses to a huge captive audience would require many sections and a far larger staff, which we could not immediately recruit, as the courses in Western civilization and humanties do, from the other departments of the college. For the time being, therefore, we are working for a gradual buildup in staff to handle the steadily increasing demand. We consider it significant, however, that our progress so far has been made with a nucleus of only two specialists rather than with a whole galaxy of experts drawn from the graduate school. This would seem to suggest that smaller liberal arts colleges could present a program in Asian studies similar to the one described without having to assemble a large corps of specialists. (*Journal of Higher Education*, January 1959)

Teaching Materials for Foreign Area Instruction

*by Robert F. Byrnes**

Mr. Byrnes is director of the International Affairs Center, Indiana University.

One of the imperative requirements facing American education is to increase significantly the number of Americans who have fluent command of some of the important foreign languages and to increase the general level of understanding of the rest of the world. We need not only to create a highly trained group of foreign language teachers and a corps of specialists about the various parts of the world, we must also raise the general level of understanding of other cultures. Within the educational system, we need both to increase the understanding of other peoples and to create ways of analyzing other cultures for our students. This can be most effectively done in this country through the high schools, through which almost every American youngster passes but which almost totally fail to provide skilled instruction at a mature level concerning that part of the world beyond the European-American sector.

The great expansion and improvement in quality of higher education in the last two decades has enormously widened the gap between the specialists and the general public, a gap which is a threat to the survival of democratic government. Raymond Aron, the celebrated French scholar and observer, has noted the high quality of American research on areas such as Russia and East Europe and the shockingly low level of public understanding of the critical issues arising from or reflecting developments within that part of the world. American universities and colleges must recognize both the great gains of the past few years and the new requirements placed on them to disseminate the new learning through special programs for college and high school teachers and through the preparation and publication of teaching materials and of guides or handbooks for those materials.

During the last 15 or 20 years, the American people have made extraordinary progress in increasing their knowledge about other parts of the world. We now have a number of first-rate graduate centers where hundreds of scholars and other area specialists are developed and where significant articles and books are published. Foreign languages are more widely and more skillfully taught than ever before; indeed, one of the quiet revolutions of our times has been the change in foreign language instruction in this country. Moreover, the numerous experiments in foreign language instruction are developing new techniques which are clearly going to increase our efficiency. Thus both in the establishment of excellent training centers and in the progress made in foreign language teaching we have created a base

---

*© 1965, Phi Delta Kappa, Inc.

from which further progress can be made. The circumstances are particularly auspicious because of the rising national concern with the study of other parts of the world and because of the great interest demonstrated by our very best students, both in high school and college.

This great change has been carried out in part because of the increased availability of funds. This enormous expansion of interest, reflected in both research and instruction, has been financed in large part by the universities and colleges, but private foundations have added very considerably and Federal funds have been important in the last few years. In fact, the passage of the National Defense Education Act has made increasingly large sums of money available, particularly for improving and expanding foreign language instruction, both in the colleges and now in the high schools. One of the current problems is to make effective use of the new kinds of funds available for language and area centers in the colleges and for language teaching and area instruction in the high schools as well, particularly in producing the most needed kinds of printed materials concerning the foreign areas, for language teachers and students as well as for college and high school students eager to learn about another culture. Indeed, given the nature of the change which is taking place and given the historical pattern, which has emphasized the investment in graduate schools, we now need a new look at the situation in the colleges and in the high schools, as well as greatly expanded sums of money for research purposes for preparing materials for training teachers. We have the specialists or the theologians in the main centers, and the trickle of highly trained young men and women from these centers into other universities and colleges is now obvious. We now need to train "parish priests" for work in the hundreds of colleges and thousands of high schools, and we need to provide these "parish priest" teachers with the basic materials which they and their pupils will need.

In other words, we must look at this problem on three levels: the graduate school level, where the situation is in basically good control; the college level, where some teachers and some materials are available, and where some institutions have made extraordinary progress; and the high school level, where there is great interest and great need, but where the beginnings are only now being made.

A number of our finest institutions have created a series of excellent undergraduate courses on particular foreign areas, in many cases multidisciplinary and in many cases provided now with teaching materials of high quality. Thus some institutions, such as the University of Chicago in the field of Indian studies, Harvard in the field of East Asian studies, and Berkeley in the field of East Asian studies, have established splendid training programs, organized fine undergraduate courses, and created effective teaching materials which have been used well there and are now being adopted by other colleges in other parts of the country.

However, probably the most impressive achievement in undergraduate education and in producing and publishing teaching materials for undergraduate courses has been contributed by Columbia University, particularly by its committee on oriental studies. This fascinating and excellent program is now about 16 years old, but it was built on the famous contemporary civilization course and approach established at Columbia shortly after the end of the First World War. Indeed, the teaching materials used in the oriental humanities and oriental civilization courses at Columbia reflect the same approach and the same patterns established earlier for Western civilization courses. Consequently, Columbia has splendid courses on the Near East and on China and Japan which could easily be adopted by institutions throughout the United States. The course on oriental humanities, for example, had produced by 1964 a "Guide to Oriental Classics," an annotated bibliography of recommended secondary readings, with topics identified for discussion, which lists most of the important books available in English, and which can be purchased for only $1.80.

The oriental civilization course at Columbia has produced a number of teaching materials which other institutions could now adopt and put to most effective use. These include the syllabus, which has been used for 16 years and which has been improved constantly from its earlier mimeographed form. In addition, the Columbia faculty has produced translations of important texts, with useful commentary. They have produced volumes of source materials, with two paperback volumes for Japan, for China, and for India. In addition, Columbia has helped to stimulate the Heath Publishing Co. to establish a splendid series entitled "Problems in Ancient Civilization." This series includes books such as one titled "The Chinese Civil Service" and another new one on "Early Chinese Literature." These volumes, some of which are descriptive and some of which are analytical, are of use for supplementary reading in all kinds of courses. In fact, Columbia for several years has offered courses for teachers, entitled "Approaches to the Oriental Civilizations" or "Approaches to the Oriental Classics," which indicate what the important materials are and help instruct the teachers in how to make effective use of them.

Finally, demonstrating that these materials can be used in high schools, Columbia University during the last few years has offered a special program for gifted high school students in New York City, the students meeting either at Columbia University or at various centers throughout the city and using the same materials used in Columbia College.

The Columbia performance and achievement are so impressive that they constitute a model which other universities could follow in preparing materials for use in courses dealing with other parts of the world. In fact, our main problem is to find the equivalent of Prof. Theodore de Bary for the other foreign areas and to have him follow the pattern which Columbia has adopted so effectively.

One should not rush to the conclusion that the Columbia University achievement can easily be duplicated, or that duplication alone will achieve the required goal, if only because a study made at Indiana in 1958 reveals how much progress must be made in all of our colleges before we attain our goal. In 1958, less than 1 percent of the students in the 35 Indiana colleges and universities were taking a course which dealt specifically with any foreign area. Some progress has been made in the last 6 years, due to a program financed in part by Indiana University and in part by the Ford Foundation and designed to expand and improve instruction on the non-Western areas in all of the colleges and universities in the State.

This program has established an information center at Indiana University, has provided fellowships for faculty retraining for all of the colleges in the State, has organized conferences on important subjects on the different campuses, and has financed a series of lectures and faculty seminars on the different campuses. However, even though several institutions have made so much progress that they are now unrecognizable, compared to 1958, the hard core of the majority are still basically uninfluenced. This situation prevails throughout the United States, a good indication of the kind of problem we all face.

Indiana has created another program which might be related or hitched to the Columbia materials. The History Department of Indiana University has created a very effective system for building a link between the university and the high school, a system which could put to very effective use the kinds of materials which Columbia University has produced. Briefly, this program, which is financed in large part by the Lilly Endowment and in part by the university, provides a large number of fellowships for summer study by high school and junior high school teachers of American history. It also provides that a member of the Indiana University History Department visit high schools each semester, observing classes, reviewng the library, discussing problems with teachers, and talking with the superintendents, the principals, the boards of education, and the parent-teacher associations. In addition, the program has produced an excellent annotated list of basic books in American history which every high school library ought to own, and it provides reading courses for the Lilly fellows throughout the academic year. Finally, the university maintains a corps of men called coordinators whose main function is to maintain a steady link between the high school and the college and to break down the isolation of the high school teacher and the high school as a whole from the larger academic community.

The Lilly program has been remarkably successful, but the 6 years of progress only serve to identify how much remains to be done, not only for American history but for the study of the rest of the world as well. In fact, the Lilly program and the non-Western program in the State of Indiana serve as illustrations of the methods which can be used to put the teaching materials, once produced, into the hands of the teachers and to create the bridge between the university or the college, on the one hand, and the high school teacher and the high school on the other hand.

Many high schools throughout the United States have made considerable progress on their own, or with the assistance of neighboring colleges and universities, in expanding and improving instruction concerning the foreign areas. Mesa Verde High School in Arizona is a special case, illustrating the way in which one high school on its own can face up to the problem.

Some States have begun to make progress by establishing formal requirements and by assisting the high schools to meet these requirements. For example, Wisconsin now requires a 2-year block of world history at the 11th and 12th grades. The State of Pennsylvania requires a half year of study of a non-Western area, with emphasis on culture, in either the 9th or 10th grade. New York State requires a year of work on other areas in the ninth grade. These are only samples of the States which are designing new requirements in American education.

Both the States and the schools are being assisted by individual universities, by organizations such as the North Central Association of

Schools and Colleges, and by the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation. For example, the University of Illinois is planning to organize a 2-year sequence on world culture, with the second year devoted to non-Western areas, for the high schools in the State of Illinois, and the University of California has a project on Asian studies, supported in part by the Office of Education, to develop materials on Asia for the various levels of primary education, beginning with the fifth grade. The Carnegie Institute of Technology, with the financial assistance of the Office of Education, has a promising project on social studies designed for able students in grades 9 through 12. This cooperative project between the institute and some of the Pittsburgh high schools has set aside the 10th grade for world history, with the first semester devoted to Western civilization and with the second semester devoting 4 weeks each to Brazil, South Africa, China, and India, with a special concentration on interdisciplinary studies and on the cultural history of each of these important countries.

The North Central Association of Schools and Colleges has had a foreign relations project for 10 years which aims at closing the gap between the American history texts and the newspapers. In other words, this program emphasizes the interest of the American Government and the American people in other areas of the world. The association has consequently arranged a number of conferences for high school teachers and has done a great deal of work in making available materials for high school teachers who are interested in introducing information about the non-Western areas into their social studies, especially history, courses.

Finally, the National Science Foundation has awarded contracts to assist various groups of scholars in preparing materials for secondary schools, particularly materials on various foreign areas. Thus, for example, it is supporting a group of anthropologists who seek to inject information about world history from the anthropological point of view into 10-grade courses. Another contract supports sociologists and another cultural geographers in preparing materials for use in high schools.

The State of New York has created another program which offers some promise as a model, either on a State, a regional, or a national basis. The Foreign Areas Center, established in New York City in 1963, is an information center which provides slides and tapes for interested high school teachers, has produced an annotated guide of books available in English in paperback on Russia, and has prepared a list paperbacks on other foreign areas of the world as well.

Finally, American commercial publishers have contributed significantly to this new revolution. Many publishers, particularly Frederick Praeger in New York, have published a flood of extraordinarily good books for the graduate school and college level. Some of these books are of utility for high school teachers and high school pupils as well. There are now some textbooks, such as that of Prof. Leften Stavrianos of Northwestern University, on world history, and there are now two or three quite good textbooks on Russian history specifically designed for the high school reader.

Thus we have reached such a stage in our progress, enabling us to look both back and ahead, that we are well placed to create strategy for the years ahead, particularly for preparing teaching materials for instruction concerning foreign areas and for making arrangements for putting these teaching materials to effective use. Several needs remain, as follows:

1. Perhaps the most important need now is a brief manual for both high school and college teachers on how to study a foreign culture. Such a methodological guide would be even more important than specific information about particular cultures. In other words, we need a procedural manual, prepared by one or two people or by a three-man team, which would indicate to teachers and students as well how one goes about studying another cultural area. This is more difficult than it seems, but a handbook of this kind would be immensely useful for all involved in education, regardless of the particular foreign area they seek to study. A well-organized and carefully prepared manual should give the student and teacher some idea of the nature of his own world, the necessity for understanding and accepting values different from the ones with which we are familiar, and the way in which one should look at or study another culture if he is going to understand it properly without surrendering any of his own traditions and values. A number of scholars could contribute effectively to such a handbook, such as George and Louise Spindler of Stanford University and George Stewart of the University of California in Berkeley.

2. We need also a guide to materials already available in English. A great many books have been published in various parts of the country and many other works are in progress. We need an annotated bibliographical review of the books and especially of the syllabi which have been of particular value in different institutions. This guide ought to be an introduction to particular foreign areas or foreign cultures, it ought to identify the principal area centers and area specialists who could assist teachers in colleges and high schools, and it ought to have a section on approaches to the various foreign areas.

In the preparation of this guide to materials, the work of the committee on oriental studies ought to be particularly useful, as should that of the joint committee on slavic studies.

3. The third great need is the selection and production of effective teaching materials, reproduced in such a way as to be readily available for teachers at both the college and the high school level. In fact, other foreign areas still lack what Professor de Bary and his colleagues at Columbia University have done for some parts of the Orient. If we could identify and reproduce the Columbia approach for all of the foreign areas, we should indeed have achieved a great deal. Among the materials most urgently required now for each of the foreign areas are: (a) Guides to books and to syllabi; (b) general texts on individual civilizations or cultures, some of historical character and some of analytical or tipocal character; (c) general introductory books, such as histories of Chinese literature or histories of Chinese poetry; (d) compilations of collections of basic texts; (e) translations of basic works for all levels and courses, perhaps with the originals on one page for those who wish to study the language and with the translation on the opposite page; (f) visual materials such as slides prepared by scholars, a photographic archive carefully catalogued, and a bibliography of film footage for those especially interested in modern history.

4. We know also that most high schools could put to splendid use a kind of package library for each foreign area in which they are inter-

ested, because high school librarians and teachers do not now have and cannot be expected to have the necessary knowledge for determining which books they ought to buy. For each foreign area or culture, the scholars ought to identify a package paperback library of the basic books which every high school ought to have and which could be used as a base upon which to build.

5. In addition, we need a manual for each foreign area, with one section devoted to substantive information, another providing an annotated bibliography, and a third providing study questions. Such a volume would inspire and assist teachers, many of whom are eager to begin instruction concerning neglected parts of the world and who seek only a handbook of methodological instructions, the basic information, and assistance in finding study materials.

6. To insure that these materials be put to maximum use, 10 or 15 centers should be established at unversities in various parts of the country to assist the teachers. Some of these centers might specialize in a given area, such as Russia and Eastern Europe, and others might specialize in all foreign areas for a given part of the United States, such as the Southwest. In any case, the centers should make use of the specialists located in the great universities, who should provide consultation and information services for the teachers and the administrators, should distribute the published materials and syllabi for the courses, and should provide guidance for the teachers in putting these materials to work in already established courses. In fact, these materials centers should be active warehouses, providing both the materials themselves and the guidance, and serving to bridge the gap between the universities and the high schools.

7. In addition, the various area centers and perhaps the materials centers should organize conferences for teachers who are interested in giving courses on particular foreign areas or in introducing information about various foreign areas into other courses, such as those on world history or on international politics. These conferences should be of various kinds, such as brief seminars, summer conferences of a week or two induration, and summer institutes of 8 or 10 weeks' duration.

Education and World Affairs, which was established to help carry out the revolution involving instruction on the non-Western areas in the colleges around the country, might be persuaded to accept full responsibility for this program as a whole, or at least for guiding and maintaining the materials centers, which are absolutely essential if this program for publishing materials is to put the materials into the hands where they can be best used. (*Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1965.)

The Challenge for Foreign Area Studies

*by Richard M. Morse**

Mr. Morse, professor of history and chairman of Latin American studies at Yale University, questioned the goals and methods of non-Western area studies in a paper presented to the 1965 Princeton University Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in the United States.

It is well accepted that "Western" and "non-Western" are woefully inadequate rubrics for a dichotomy of the modern world, and that their sole value is as euphemisms for the invidious "development" polarity. As a Latin Americanist—indeed as a native of America—I am little bothered by arbitrary or irrelevant nomenclature that serves a practical function. However—also as a Latin Americanist— I am aware of a special irony in the fact that "my" region is lumped, somewhat apologetically, with the non-West. The point is not that Latin America is in some intermediate category because of its *mestizo* and Afro-American components or its halfway-house economic development. The point is that Latin America is incorrigibly "Western." What makes it such a riddle to us is not the ritual cannibalism of the Tupinamba Indians or its corporativist strategies for development, but the fact that nothing in American culture—and very little in American pedagogy—prepares us to understand the social philosophies of those eminently Western thinkers, Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas.

In other words I challenge two notions: (1) That the American educational establishment now competently purveys the premises of the "Western" heritage and is *therefore* ready to take on the remaining world civilizations; (2) that what "Western" operationally means is Judaeo-Greco-Latin-Christian. I find it hard to reconcile the statement that our "educational horizons" now embrace "the heritage that we derive from Greek philosophers, Hebrew prophets, and post-renaissance scientists" [1] with the statement that: "The trinity of Greek, Latin, and mathematics was firmly established in colonial America, not to be disestablished until after the Revolution." [2] It is little short of impudent to affirm that the "liberal tradition in our education" was "born of Hellenic thought, strengthened by the Roman and Judeo-Christian heritage, rediscovered in the high Middle Ages, and re-emphasized by the humanistic revival of the Renaissance." [3] How much more refreshingly honest is Santayana: "In academic America the Platonic and Catholic traditions had never been planted: it was only the Calvinistic tradition, when revived in some modern disguise, that could stir there the secret chord of reverence and enthusiasm." [4]

---

*© 1966, American Council on Education.

[1] *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College* (Washington: Association of American Colleges, 1964), p. 12.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[3] *The College and World Affairs* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964), pp. 8–9.

[4] George Santayana, *Character and Opinion in the United States* (New York: W. W. Norton, Co., n.d.), p. 40.

What is mostly meant by "West" and "non-West," then is "Protestant" and "non-Protestant"—or if "non-Protestant" is too deprivative, we might call them the lonely crowd and the communitarian societies. Such a division identifies the archetypal role of the United States and cuts Europe to accord England her reluctant partnership, Germany her accustomed schizophrenia, Denmark her showcase function, and Catholic France (Calvin's homeland) her coveted marginality.

If one were to chart some historical moments of American concern with self-knowledge and the wider world—to include perhaps the thought of Jonathan Edwards, Jefferson, the Transcendentalists, and some moderns (Hutchins, Conant, Kerr, Riesman, *et al.*)—it is by no means certain that these would rise in an ascending parabola from parochialism to mature and cosmopolitan world involvement. One might even say that in recent generations our educational horizons have contracted within the horizons of the Western heritage. Our very origins were of course sectarian—but they constituted a Protestantism defiant toward, perplexed by, grappling with other traditions. If America ever did cast off from history and the world, it is more likely that this happened in the late nineteenth century than in the seventeenth or the eighteenth. Pedagogical attempts of the recent past to restore communion with our deeper history through meditation upon "great books" have the same preciosity and antiseptic piety which characterize the contemporary insistence upon "integration" of non-Western studies: "Only when such offerings form a coherent whole can the institution be said to have established a program of non-Western studies."[5]

A premise in much of the promotional literature about foreign area studies in our schools and colleges is that the United States, after long isolation from the world and immersion in domestic concerns, has now assumed the mantle of world leadership and must overhaul its educational system in unprecedented ways to meet its new obligations. Such a view of our past is highly condescending. It also inhibits us from looking to our own national history for cues, and encourages us to resort to improvisation, gimmickry, scientism, and organizational legerdemain. I confess my ingenuous enthusiasm for Paul Goodman's contrast between Jefferson's stress upon an educational quest to *determine national goals* and Dr. Conant's stress upon harnessing education to *preestablished national goals*.

It would be a mistake, then, to isolate the status of area studies as "the problem." Why is it that despite a rising tide of surveys and analyses of the place of non-Western studies in curricula, the overviews of our educational establishment (Conant, Goodman) make almost no reference to the need and strategies for new cross-cultural commitments? So far does this go that one of our most distinguished educational leaders contributes to a committee report on *The University and World Affairs* and, in the same year, publishes a book of his own, *Excellence*, which, though chiefly concerned with American education, leaves the international horizon virtually unmentioned.

SOME QUESTIONS

If there are serious question in the air about the American educational establishment itself, our primary concern should not be merely with non-Western studies and the options of tacking them on, infusing them, or integrating them at school and college levels. Insofar as we are defining purposes and not procedures, we are really asking: Is this the proper moment for the rest of the world to become visible to us? The question seems rhetorical. But when we recall that the traditional Protestant way of handling uncomfortable or alien situations is to declare them invisible (Ralph Ellison's "invisible man"; nonrecognition of China), we find ourselves before an important spiritual or at least psychotherapeutical challenge. Here are some questions which this big one unlocks:

---

[5] *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College*, p. 56.

1. A large majority of youths who pass through the American educational establishment, including those who reach the doctoral level, do so without significant, sustained exposure to the history and culture of three-fourths of the world. Is this mere oversight, or does it reflect a powerful foreshortening of educational philosophy?

2. If we assume a homogeneous, economically successful nation with a large population and area and no history of threatening neighbors on its borders (I presume that the United States alone meets this definition, though Australia meets most of it), is it *possible* for such a nation to develop sophistication toward alien cultures by reforming its domestic school system?

3. Education presumably derives from the sensitive examination of *any* piece of experience. If this be so, then the claim that American education is inferior because it gives insufficient attention to the non-Western world should be restated as an accusation that American studies and Western civilization are now badly taught. Do American studies programs seriously consider the American experience of a score of other New World countries? Is Western Europe made known to us as much more than "background" and "influences"? Does the study of Germany and England go much beyond conventional offerings in history, literature, and philosophy? Do we explore the social anthropology of France? A recent declaration that Western European studies are a legitimate preserve for area studies philanthropy might charitably be interpreted as recognition of these deficiencies. Be that as it may, the message to pressure groups for non-Western studies is that their cause is less than hopeful until the dog of parochialism leaps from the manger of Western studies—where, eventually, the non-Western horse must feed. To make the point differently: It would try me sorely to decide whether it is more important to restore Greek to the central curriculum or introduce the study of Indonesian politics. But just as it seems improbable that the former will occur simply as the result of a classicists-of-the-world-unite movement, so is it unlikely that the latter will occur, in any meaningful fashion, simply from the lobbying of non-Western pressure groups.

4. We have stumbled on the central pedagogical implication of non-Western studies. We are no longer asking how best to smuggle these studies into standard curricula now that we are convinced of their use and respectability. We are instead saying that the only conceivable justification for smuggling them in is that they serve as a Trojan horse for educational reform (which might, like the recent general education movement, be effective for a generation or so). It matters little that non-Western course content be taught. As Paul Goodman has said, we are presumably to teach young people, not subject matter.

Our non-Western specialists are important to us not because they penetrate Oriental mysteries or predict Caribbean surprises but because they angle into subject matter freshly. They recognize no pecking order or compartmentalization of scholarly disciplines, no walls between Great Traditions and popular or folkloric ones. This produces a good deal of cant about "integrated" and "interdisciplinary" programs. But it also shows up our "Western" specialists as performing largely curatorial functions.[6]

The real use of non-Western studies is in the emotional and intellectual shock they give. If this shock were now being provided by American studies—that is, if our students were experiencing their own culture as *foreign*—the situation would be propitious *ipso facto* for non-Western studies to find their proper curricular nest without elaborate strategies and apologies. To put it the other way, only when American culture is so experienced will we know that non-Western studies have found their nest.

THE UNIVERSITIES

As a loyal academic I should at some point make a pious statement about the efficacies of education, and the bell-wether role of universities in pioneering new fields of knowledge and transmitting fresh orientations to the school system and the public bureaucracies. The more one reflects on it, however, the more one suspects that our own educational establishment functions not much differently from those which we are so quick to criticize in foreign lands: that is, it celebrates the national culture more than it innovates, it harnesses aptitudes more than it nurtures dissidence, it is a rock to be pried more than a lever for change. To judge by some nostalgic accounts, the first and last great age of the universities was the thirteenth century. Since then whole generations, even centuries, have elapsed in the English-speaking world when universities were in quarantine against intellectual ferment and leadership.

American universities, often ensconced on comfortable land grants, have been singularly docile in taking leads from the Federal Government. They never bite the hand that feeds; at best they glower a moment before eating. They dutifully produce atom bombs and Tagalog speakers. When the chill winds of McCarthyism blow from Washington, they philosophically hunch their shoulders against them. When the calls to New Frontiers and Great Societies are issued, they respond with cautious sympathy.

For generations the large, well-estabished American universities have been tending discreet flames on the hearths of non-Westren scholarship. The fact that the fires are now being fueled sufficiently to cast modest warmth is owing to efforts from extra-university sources: Social Science Research Council, American Council of Learned Societies, the foundations, the government. Given the circumspection of the donors and the diffused focus of university administrations, there is no immediate prospect that whole academic edifices will catch fire from these freshly stoked hearths. However, we must not lose sight of our proposition that non-Western studies may be a Trojan horse for sweeping educational reform. And we must face up to every implication of the fact that extra-university agencies are carpentering the horse.

---

[6] The subversive potential of the non-Western language and area center has not gone unperceived in the Office of Education: "Its ultimate effect may well be to so revitalize and reinvigorate the liberal arts that they may once again become a dominant force in our national life." Donald N. Bigelow, "The Center Concept and the Changing Curriculum." *Higher Education*, July 1962, p. 8.

For at least two reasons the university cannot be expected to generate, unassisted, the educational revolution which the non-Western impact shows it to stand in need of. First, academic promotion procedures tend to purge aggressiveness from policy formation. That is, most establishments (business, foundations, Federal bureaucracies) draw their leaders from tenured, routinized strata and place them in precarious policy positions where they must show their stuff. Universities give tenure to those in precarious lower strata once they have shown their stuff. Academic programs might take a sudden jolt forward if their directors were deprived of tenure and given triple salaries.

The second point is that universities are less able than other establishments to hierarchize or harmonize disparate or antithetical goals. A business firm or a TV station rarely searches its soul when confronted by the maximum profits—public service dilemma. A university, bogged down in duties and pieties, seems impotent before such real or alleged dichotomies as research-teaching, education-training, pure scholarship-aid to the underdeveloped, sympathy for the non-West—counsel for the Pentagon. It is almost defenseless against this type of shotgun blast:

> At the center of these new educational demands, all the more pressing because they often coincide with the policy goals of our Government, stands the American university. It is challenged to meet the needs of our own people for a far better knowledge and understanding of others. It is challenged at the same time to help meet the needs of emerging nations for the creation and rapid improvement of whole educational systems.
>
> Whether the rapid technological and social development upon which nations insist will take place by totalitarian regimentation or in conditions of growing individual freedom and responsibility is a crucial question of our times. It is an educational question as well as a social, economic and political question.[7]

In these two brief paragraphs the university is summoned to the following, probably incompatible tasks: (1) to further U.S. policy goals, (2) to give Americans a better understanding of other peoples, (3) to help other nations "emerge," (4) to help other nations emerge along nontotalitarian paths.

The need to clarify ground rules for Government-university cooperation became apparent at a recent conference on Latin America where the Government and academic sectors commingled. The former led off with a well-rounded, self-consistent, and, we thought, quite wrong-headed explication and defense of Washington's Latin American policy. Instead of replying properly, the academics were somehow thrown back on a disjointed and apologetic statement of their "role." What went unsaid, unfortunately, was that a prime function of universities is to nurture our only groups of spokesmen whose constituencies are the peoples of other societies. By spokesmen I do not mean salesmen of this or that brand of exotic leftism. I mean persons who have sympathetic commitments to another culture in its entirety, who respond to the pressures of its past, the logic of its history, the exigencies of its present, the limits and turbulence and promise of its future.

---

[7] *The University and World Affairs* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1961), p. 1.

It is by now apparent that my bias is more toward recovery of wisdom than toward advancement of science. I am skeptical of the deification of research. I am chilled by the matter-of-fact statement that American social scientists—

> who had paid little attention to the non-Western world, were now [1940's] beginning to realize that data on all significant societies in the world were important to the theoretical growth of their disciplines. Generalizations should be based on as broad a range of comparable data as possible.[8]

I am romantic enough to see the publication of Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* as culturally more generous in its day than the creation of data banks for Burma and Chile in our own. I am naive enough to wonder whether the 146 graduate language and area programs at 61 universities are nourishing the kind of sensibility which produced, or even responds to, Forster's *Passage to India.*

From this *parti pris* let me recapitulate what I take as optimum goals for non-Western studies programs that should inform university-Government negotiations:

1. *Pedagogical.* To educate American youths to participate in their *own* culture.
2. *Tactical.* To serve as beachheads for broad academic reform.
3. *Representational.* To provide mature, permanent constituencies for foreign cultures and societies (not political regimes) within our country.

To these I would add: (4)*International liaison.* It is high time that American universities inserted themselves into an international university community. This means primary networks of cooperative, reciprocally acting, noncompetitive institutions which absorb the basic costs of liaison into their normal financing. Saturation assistance operations, academic rivalries for research monopolies and foreign operations platforms, limitation of exchange to area specialists, and American campus enclaves overseas are generally not congruent with a mature liaison program.

These four goals have at least the virtue of mutual compatibility. It is in subordination to them that I would hope to see academic concertmasters orchestrate the secondary motifs: hard-nosed research; advancement of science; massive technical assistance operations; maintenance of data and talent banks as a national resource; professional or semi-professional training of diplomats, technical consultants, international lawyers and businessmen, journalists, and secret agents.

Now it is clear that universities approach the traditional strongholds of Government concern with international affairs under this four-point banner, they will be turned back. The four goals are irrelevant—and at least one antithetical—to the usual interests of the State-Defense Departments axis. But happily our Government is not a unisplendored thing. The Peace Corps (which breaks up the cloistered university grind), the Fulbright-Hays program (a Trojan horse within the State Department, which insists that traveling students enroll in foreign universities), and perhaps the science and the humanities foundations are all allies of the universities and even catalysts for university renovation. But the real burden of mediating between educational goals and national goals is being assumed by the mushrooming Office of Education—which declares education itself to be a national goal. To appreciate the implications of this new Federal commitment to education, one need only contrast the ideology-free aims of OE's area centers and summer institutes with the State Department's impudent scheme to create or reupholster a chain of "Inter-American universities" throughout Latin America. Even so circumspect a document as an Education and World Affairs report observes apprehensively:

---

[8] George E. Taylor, "The Leadership of the Universities," *The Non-Western World in Higher Education: Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* November 1964, p. 3.

A leading Latin American sociologist writes of American social scientists in Latin America:

> "(*a*) they produce an accumulation of data irrelevant for the knowledge of the social structure of the region or its different national societies;
>
> "(*b*) they do not contribute all that would be necessary and possible to the development of antonomous thought and the formation of higher personnel for social research;
>
> "(*c*) they do not increase or facilitate the creation of a 'universe of communication' among Latin American institutions and sociologists; on the contrary, they distort it."

Jorge Graciarena, "Some Considerations on International Cooperation and the Recent Development of Sociological Research in Latin America." Paper for the International Conference on Comparative Social Research in Developing Countries, Buenos Aires, Sept. 7–16, 1964.

> Relations between CU [Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State] and the Office [of Education] have long been marked by controversy. It is probably unrealistic though tempting, to believe that the air might be cleared by discussions aimed at formal agreement on basic policies.[9]

It is not in the interests of educators to remain neutral in any battle of the commissars which may be in the offing.

I am not one who wrings his hands over American monolinguism, for it has not been my experience that Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Spaniards are significantly more venturesome than we in linguistic matters. Moreover, I assume that the main question has nothing to do with mobilizing special knowledge and techniques for teaching exotic languages. This problem might be critical in Brazil or Turkey, but not in the nation best equipped for technifying pedagogy and for storing and disseminating knowledge. Finally, I assume that linguistic achievement is sharply conditioned by environment. Several years ago I was invited to lead a sixth-grade class in a school in Curaçao. These were students whose native tongue was Papiamento but who had received all their instruction in Dutch from the first grade on. Since I knew neither language, I asked them to translate sight passages from three tertiary languages: French, English, and Spanish. This they did with unusual ease, and some, who planned to study in Europe, were even embarking on German.

The precollege years are ideal for language study, and one is heartened by reports of current success with Russian and Far Eastern tongues at this level. There are limits, however, to how far pedagogical and technological ingenuity can go in creating a climate of motivation. The substitution of mimetic techniques for paradigmatic analysis threatens to purge the last vestige of intellectual challenge from language learning. One is saddened to see one's graduate students yearning to plunge into omnivorous reading but forced to intone aimless colloquialisms in the language lab, as though condemned to endless recitals of linguistic sin in the isolation of an electronic confession box.

---

[9] *The U.S. Office of Education: A New International Dimension* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964), p. 6.

In short, the rationalization of language teaching is no substitute for cultural involvement. Private duty and national need are meager incentives to learning.

The wholeness of teaching

I admit to some distress at the occasional suggestion that introductory area studies programs be pushed back into the high schools. When this began happening with general education or Western civilization courses, it seemed to betray weariness on the part of colleges and lack of inventiveness (or of self-confidence) on the part of schools. We should make sure that students will not be subjected to a repetitive and never-deepening series of integrated introductions to "civilizations" from the ninth grade through the M.A.

In my ignorance of the ways of pedagogy I must rely for simple guidelines on Whitehead's three stages of romance, precision, and generalization. The stage of romance capitalizes on the "freshness of inexperience"; it provides "plenty of independent browsing amid firsthand experiences, involving adventures of thought and action."

> [A] block in the assimilation of ideas inevitably arises when a discipline of precision is imposed before a stage of romance has run its course in the growing mind. There is no comprehension apart from romance.

Unfortunately I have no clear notions of how to institutionalize "romance" in school curricula. It does seem, though, that the social sciences, which figure so prominentaly in area programs, are appropriate only very selectively at this level. It is a truism that intellectual response to and grasp of the social sciences develop much later than for the humanities and natural sciences, usually not until after the age at which their professional practitioners are certified as "doctors."

As I cast about for alternatives to high school courses on African history and chaperoned discussion groups on Vietnam policy, it occurs to me that it might be refreshing to subsidize a large invasion of creative talent—writers, artists, musicians, actors, dancers—from foreign lands into our high schools. They would be persons without the pedigrees or specialism or academic docility or knowledge of English required by universities, or else persons whom it would be a pity to incarcerate as artists-in-residence for the rarefied pleasure of a few graduate students. This would not be a hand-me-down college program, but something *better*—more vital and unpredictable—than colleges dare sponsor. Each guest would be received without fanfare by a school; given his or her atelier, music room, or book-lined study; oriented to the cultural facilities of the city or community The visitors would have no formal teaching duties. A few curious students would make overtures. There would be linguistic challenges. Impromptu and unorthodox language classes would develop. The artists would begin to teach, tutor, or perform in his medium. Through that medium, and in a hundred other ways, he would begin to create impressions, arouse curiosity, transmit knowledge and skills, communicate a new style of life, a different view of the world, a common humanity. Some visitors would be a fiasco—as indeed are many courses and programs. Others might stay a year, two years, even a lifetime.

Quite obviously, I find it hard to translate pedagogical innovation into curriculums, course content, and teacher-training programs. I keep thinking of *persons* who would innovate, embody wisdom and broad experience, and serve, in Aristotle's phrase, as "models for action." Clearly such persons must be produced domestically as well as imported. I would set as a goal the recruitment of one or more teachers for each school who would individually represent one or more foreign cultures as their "constituency." They would each have their own disciplinary interests, but an important part of their education would be the area studies background which has become unacceptable as a pedigree for university careers. I would imagine them to be wiser, more rounded, more steeped in a foreign culture than college teachers of the same age group. They would be concerned with transmitting a sense of the style and excitement and wholeness of other cultures. They would often travel abroad, usually with small groups of students whose enthusiasms had been touched. They would not be specialists. Indeed their presence would be a rebuke to the shocking trend toward teacher specialization that now reaches even into elementary schools. Their opportunities, responsibilities, and prestige might be more enviable than those of most college teachers.

The recruitment and education of these teacher-counselors should not be left loosely to area studies programs. The task demands the leadership of specific groups of scholars who combine intellectual focus with breadth of outlook. On the basis of my own experience with general education programs (and at the risk of being intolerably invidious) I will venture that anthropologists, philosophers, and historians might be three kinds of scholars who would most fully comprehend the implications of the challenge and whose ideas and talents might be tapped to address it successfully.

The educational chute

The public school which my children attend no longer has grades I, II, and III. It has 15 "progress levels" instead. Children are now measured, graded, and sorted like eggs as they roll down the educational chute. The grade A jumbos who reach the end and drop into the liberal arts Ph.D. box ideally complete the descent (!) at age 24 or 25. Unless an educational experience other than schooling has intervened, these persons will lack the assurance and wisdom needed to analyze foreign mind sets and social systems. The one frantic year of doctoral research in Cairo or Quito—relearning a language, getting sick, pacifying a wife and children, desperately redefining and truncating a thesis topic under sudden anxieties about professional failure—hardly qualifies as a remedial experience.

The rationalization and speedup of schooling, unless corrected for, increasingly divorces students from life. It is a subcategory of the broader process described by Cassirer as the rationalization of our symbolic universe. "Physical reality seems to recede in proportion as man's symbolic activity increases. Instead of dealing with things themselves man is in a sense constantly conversing with himself." The antidote to speedup, testing, sorting, and electronic teaching is periodic surcease and exposure to the world. Here again the Federal Government comes to the rescue with the Peace Corps and military service (although it is precisely the dread of military service that forces many to tighten their grip on the academic vine). The Peace Corps seems by and large a most salutary innovation (although one forlornly wishes that it might have had an interuniversity origin); perhaps its main shortcoming is that it does not recruit substantially from the undergraduate and school levels. I am told by persons who have compared Peace Corps volunteers (specifically, those who are recent college graduates without professional training) and British Overseas Volunteers working in the same environment that the latter turn out better. Because they are younger they arrive with more linguistic aptitude, more openmindedness, less ideology, less anxiety about their subsequent careers. They have no rhetorical ideas about "community development"; they are better prepared to start off with a humble manual task and to let any larger contributions develop naturally in context.

What I am driving at is that the schoolroom's glass-brick walls need not a prison make. Youths in their teens as well as in their twenties should be periodically thrust out of the inexorable school system and into life. (The Deweyan alternative of recreating life experience in the schools no longer seems feasible). There are many opportunities for travel, work, and community involvement in our own country—beyond jobs as summer lifeguards. In the great homogeneity of America, however, one has to be a bit more ingenious to identify contexts for intercultural exposure. And even if such ingenuity is taxed to the utmost, it seems clear that high school students will have to be exported in appreciable numbers for cross-cultural inoculation if the study of foreign cultures at the college-university level is to be anything other than a hot-house growth.

But, it will be objected, if elite corps of graduate students are already causing problems and tripping over each other in foreign capitals, what will happen when planeloads of high school juniors are dumped in the streets of New Delhi? The answer is that graduate students are encouraged by their mentors—and by fellowship programs which require "significant" research—to locate in the capitals and to demand access to massive research facilities, consultation with the host country's half dozen leading scholars, and immunity to pry into the most sensitive aspects of national policy formation. Small wonder that the fifty or hundred graduate students in Rio have become so agglutinated, and even formally organized. It is surely not on quantitative grounds that a country of 80 million people finds this number of Americans to be indigestible.

We need not examine here the many headaches—logistical, organizational, political—which would arise when small detachments of thousands of high school students are deployed to the small towns of other countries. But the goal needs to be stressed. One hopes that young Americans might at that age more easily learn to live and move *inconspicuously* in another culture, to accept the world's diversity as natural, to appreciate that fellow man is an end and not a means, to distinguish between a friend and a "respondent." (Paper, Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in the United States, Princeton University, December 17–18, 1965)

LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES

The Leadership of the Universities

*by George E. Taylor**

Mr. Taylor, professor of Far Eastern History and Politics at the University of Washington, Seattle, is Director of the university's Far Eastern and Russian Institute.

The study of the non-Western world is today an important preoccupation of American higher education. During the last three decades our universities and colleges have steadily expanded their facilities for research and teaching on practically all major areas of the world beyond North America and Western Europe, the traditional base of American education. Much of this effort dates from World War II. The British, who are second only to the United States in their efforts to break the bonds of ethnocentricity,[1] have been impressed by the scale of the American effort, the kind of organization on which it is based, and its emphasis on modern studies.[2]

The immediate if not the long-range consequences of this effort to absorb the non-Western world are apparent in the expansion of the curriculum, the training of hundreds of area specialists, the teaching and study of unusual languages, the expansion of library holdings, and the growth of research and publications in the non-Western fields. General acceptance by educational authorities was recently expressed by the regents of the University of the State of New York in stating that educational programs in our schools and colleges "must be liberated from their narrow preoccupation with Western civilization in order that less provincial and more competent citizens and leaders might be developed in the future."[3] Although the Federal Government and private foundations have given impressive financial support, the institutions of higher education provided most of the initiative and must bear the continuing responsibilities.

ORIGINS OF AMERICAN EFFORTS

The character of the American effort to absorb the non-Western world into higher education derives from two interacting but different

---

*© 1964. The American Academy of Political and Social Science.

[1] See Great Britain, *Report of the Interdepartmental Commission of Enquiry on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies.* (The so-called Scarbrough Report, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1947).

[2] Great Britain, University Grants Committee, *Report of the Sub-Committee on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies.* (The so-called Hayter Report, London: University Grants Committee, 1961), p. 53.

[3] Ward Morehouse, *The International Dimensions of Education in New York State* (Albany: State Education Department, 1963), p. 7; U.S. Bureau of External Research, Department of State, *Language and Area Study Programs in American Universities* (Washington, D.C.: Department of State, 1964); Donald N. Bigelow, "The Center Concept and the Changing Curriculum," *Higher Education*, July 1962; Sydney Mintz, *A Sample Survey of Area Programs at American Universities* (New Haven: Human Relations Area Files, Yale University); "The Future of Russian Studies," *Survey*, No. 50, January 1964; Wendell C. Bennett, *Area Studies in American Universities* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951); R. B. Hall, *Area Studies* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947).

forces that came together during World War II. These forces stemmed from the needs of the country and from the needs of scholarship. The world of affairs, which has always had a powerful influence on the world of scholarship, in this case provided a stimulating and creative rather than destructive influence. The sudden expansion of American responsibilities during World War II and the complexity and urgency of the international problems which had to be faced compelled the universities to cooperate with the government in taking heroic measures to overcome vast areas of ignorance. This cooperation gave an impetus to experimentation with new techniques of teaching living languages, thus bringing to prominence the science of linguistics and preparing the way for such later developments as the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, which has provided funds for research, instruction, materials, and student support in all the critical languages and areas of the world. So sparse were our scholarly resources in 1941 that those who knew anything about the major non-Western areas had to be grouped together in teams in order to cooperate with and supplement each other, thus laying the foundation for the area centers and research programs that universities set up after the war. But it is important to note that the war and the new responsibilities of the United States would not of themselves have been sufficient explanation for the new trends if it had not been for the fact that these events coincided with a far-reaching change in the power relation between the Western and the non-Western worlds consequent on the decline of imperialism and the rise of communism. The last half-century did much to shatter the Western belief in progress and the perfectibility of man. Similarly, events have overthrown belief in the universal applicability of Western science and institutions and in the unilinear concept of societal growth. Only the Communists, who now present the developing parts of the world with a competing form of state and world organization, have continued to cling to unilinear views of societal growth and the universal applicability of Communist institutions. Americans now readily accept the political and cultural pluralism of the new world.

American scholarship was ready to take up the new challenges and opportunities that the urgent world of politics provided. It was to the social sciences that political events brought the main challenge and the greatest opportunities. The humanities had long been concerned with the religions, philosophies, languages, and arts of other societies, especially in Asia and North Africa. These wide-ranging interests were not reflected in the curriculum except in a few major universities in England and America, but the humanists, if we include religionists, had been the least culture-bound of all the disciplines.[4]

However, the social scientists and social psychologists, who had paid little attention to the non-Western world, were now beginning to realize that data on all significant societies in the world were important to the theoretical growth of their disciplines. Generalizations should be based on as broad a range of comparable data as possible. Theories about man and his behavior should be tested through study of man in all the full richness of his experience. At the same time, the growth of new conceptual tools in the social sciences, the trend towards empirical research methods, and the strong influence of positivism explain in some measure a tendency to underrate the contributions already made by the humanists to the understanding of the rest of the world and a reluctance to believe that acceptable data could be drawn from the ancient societies of Asia and Africa. The social scientist had to have modern, not classical languages; field work, not travelogs; translations, not philosophical treatises; and, above all, trustworthy statistics. There was an appreciation of the desirability of universal data but sufficient skepticism of the possibility of acquiring it to discourage investment in language-learning.

---

[4] For a discussion of pre-World War II area studies see Donald N. Bigelow and Lyman H. Legters, *NDEA Language and Area Centers* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1964).

In this situation, political pressures played their role. Much of the work that had to be done on foreign societies in World War II was done by anthropologists, social psychologists, philologists, geographers, and historians. Alexander H. Leighton and the late Clyde Kluckhohn, psychiatrist-anthropologist and anthropologist, respectively, showed what could be done by social science in the analysis of Japanese value systems even under war conditions.[5] At least as far as Asia is concerned, it is not too much to say that if the anthropologists bridged the gap between humanists and social scientists, then the structural linguists bridged the gap between the teaching of classical and modern languages. It was no accident that the Committee on World Area Research of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), set up in 1946, was under the chairmanship of a geographer and relied heavily on anthropologists. Most of the early publications on area studies were written by anthropologists, for example, Wendell C. Bennett, Julian Steward, Charles Wagley, and Sydney W. Mintz.

It was because American scholarship was ready for the challenge that the enormous demands generated by the war and its aftermath had a stimulating rather than a paralyzing effect.

UNIVERSITY INITIATIVE

Great changes such as the academic conquest of the non-Western world are not brought about in a fit of absence of mind. If the sun does not set on American scholarship today, it is because of considerable organizational effort on university campuses. When new problems arise in American higher education that require general attention, it is customary to work through one or both of the two councils, the SSRC or the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), or through one of the many professional associations.[6] In this case the SSRC set up a Committee on World Area Research in 1946 to survey developments in area research and training programs and to promote participation of social scientists in the improvement of the programs. The problems were many. In the universities, the top priority was to train area specialists, men with full competence in a discipline plus specialization in a specific area. Such men were necessary to conduct research, to train others, to give direction. While the committee also recognized the needs of government and business for men trained in foreign areas, it was expected that as higher education became more concerned with the non-Western world there would be an increasing demand for faculty competent to satisfy the teaching needs of undergraduate programs. There was also a battle to be fought on the theoretical and organizational front, for a rapid expansion of area studies was sure to meet with some resistance in the established departments. Those who were trying to promote area studies would need mutual support, financial assistance, and a national program.

---

[5] See Ruth Benedict. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (Boston: Houghton, 1946).
[6] For a list see Bennett, *op. cit.*, pp. 30–31.

Each of the major universities set up some sort of administrative device, an institute, center, or interdepartmental committee, to carry out its area program, especially when research was an objective. While faculty and students usually retained departmental ties, the institute or chairman was given enough autonomy to carry out his mission.

Important as were the contributions of the foundations and the Federal Government, they could never have been made without the original commitment of the major universities to the promotion of non-Western studies signaled by the establishment of centers or other devices. The staff and directors of these programs had to press on all fronts at the same time. They had to negotiate with departments to include area specialization in their degree programs, recruit staff, provide for language instruction, stimulate new library policies, organize research projects, induce faculty to accept new courses, attend to the demands of state educational systems for help in training high school teachers, advise foundations on the kind of assistance they needed, and maintain strong backing from the university administration. The center or program was the focus of work on the area and the unit for receipt and administration of funds. In the words of the Hayter Report:

> First they provided an excellent powerhouse to generate interest in these studies. The full-time Director and his small staff were well placed to initiate activity, and had a clear responsibility for doing so. Second, the centers with their variety of studies covering the area helped to break down the barriers between the disciplines and to encourage linguists, historians, geographers, lawyers, economists, anthropologists, and others who were all studying the same region, to meet, talk to each other, and understand one another's problems.[7]

These administrative devices impressed the British commission because they explain the difference between the slow record of the United Kingdom after the Scarbrough Report (1947) and the rapid expansion in the United States beginning about the same time. It is important to remember that the universities set up their centers in order to work out the strategy and tactics of promoting non-Western area studies, including the appeal for foundation support; the initiative came from the academic world.

For the purpose of setting national standards and helping foundations to determine where support should be given, the SSRC committee made surveys and drew up certain criteria for a good area program.[8] These criteria were (1) official university acceptance and support of the program, (2) adequate library resources for both teaching and research on the area, (3) competent instruction in the principal languages of the area, (4) offerings in at least five pertinent subjects—disciplines—in addition to language instruction, (5) some specific mechanisms for integrating the area studies, (6) an area research program, and (7) emphasis on the contemporary aspects of the area.

---

[7] Great Britain. University Grants Committee, *op. cit.*, pp. 57–58.

[8] Bennett, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

THE PRINCIPLE OF INTEGRATION

Leading scholars in the field proceeded on certain important assumptions from the very beginning. They were that language and area studies are inseparable, and that research and instruction in the area must reflect an "integrated" interdisciplinary approach. It was most certainly assumed by the SSRC committee that the problem was to get the disciplines interested in the non-Western world, not to substitute area for discipline. While substantial concentration on an area was encouraged at the M.A. level, no encouragement was given to the granting of an area Ph. D.[9]

There were varying degrees of success in applying the principle of integration to research and teaching. The difficulties were great. The area specialists came mainly from history, anthropology, geography, literature, and international relations. There were few economists, political scientists, social psychologists, or sociologists with whom to cooperate. Nor was there any common body of doctrine on the desirability of the method of interdisciplinary cooperation. But there was general acceptance of the "five discipline rule" recommended by the Committee on World Area Research, and it was applied in the administration of fellowship programs. A rule which might well have been better applied to research was ceremoniously applied to training. It was hoped that integration would take place in the mind of the student even if it had not in the mind of the professor.[10]

Although the area programs achieved their least success in cooperative interdisciplinary research, it was very important that this was set as a goal. In this way the area programs kept alive the idea that non-Western societies must be seen as a whole if they are to be properly understood. Now that more disciplines are involved, more men and materials available, and more monographic work has been done, we may be ready for another effort to solve some of the big questions about the nature of non-Western societies.

In spite of the comparative failure of area programs to bring about cooperative research among a significant number of disciplines there were several approximations to the ideal. One of the most ambitious was the University of Michigan's Okayama field station experiment out of which came a volume based on scholarly cooperation.[11] The Russian Research Center at Harvard concentrated on the production of distinguished disciplinary studies. The University of Washington's China seminar set its sights for cooperative interdisciplinary research.[12] The tendency of specialists interested in the same geographical area to meet and talk, whether in a structured manner or not, was strong enough to bring about a good deal of informal cooperation among scholars and to account for the high morale in most area programs. This was also apparent in the high degree of enthusiasm for various experiments to teach courses in Asian or non-Western civilizations as a cooperative faculty venture. Some of these experiments led to publication of jointly prepared teaching materials, thus undoubtedly contributing to the further education of the faculty.[13]

---

[9] For a discussion of the word "area" see Mintz, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[10] See Mintz, *op. cit.*, pp. 19–34.

[11] See R. K. Beardsley, John W. Hall, and Robert Hall, *Village Japan* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959).

[12] See Franz Michael, with Stanley Spector, "Cooperative Area Research," *World Politics*, II, No. 1 (October 1949), pp. 148–155.

FOUNDATION SUPPORT

The academic profession set the standards through the Committee on World Area Research, but it was foundation support that helped to speed up the progress. The Rockefeller Foundation had given support to scholars interested in non-Western areas as early as 1933; the Carnegie Corp. of New York gave substantial support immediately after the war, and the Ford Foundation came into the picture on a large scale beginning in 1951. The foreign area fellowship program, initiated by the Carnegie Corp. and now carried on jointly by the two councils, with support from the Ford Foundation, provided for a secondpost war generation of scholars who were not covered by the GI bill, which had already helped the first postwar generation of men and women to intensive language instruction. This support was decisive. It protected the integrity of the universities, made it possible to avoid additional difficulties on the campus by reducing competition for scarce funds, and provided the essential ingredient of money for foreign travel and study on a scale unheard of before, but a necessary condition of success.[14]

NDEA

The support of the foundations was later supplemented by passage of NDEA. It had become clear by 1958 that, while the major languages and areas were doing reasonably well, more especially Russia and the Far East, there was ample room for improvement in the methods of language instruction and coverage. The passage of the act was important for the tremendous lift it gave to language instruction, for the establishment of language and area centers as organizational devices to further the purposes of the Act, and for the support given to graduate students and summer institutes for secondary school teachers to improve language instruction. This act has been administered with scrupulous respect for the independence and dignity of the academic profession.[15] Among other things, as the Hayter report pointed out, it put the humanities on a level of national importance with the sciences.

The area programs today differ in detail, but all bear the mark of the patterns laid down by the Committee on World Area Research. At a minimum the main ones have intensive training in various languages and interdisciplinary degree programs for the M.A. For the Ph. D. degree in the social sciences, they provide facilities for area specialization. They have fully matured from the older departments of Sinological, Arabic, Indian, Islamic, and Slavic studies with their emphasis on classical languages and literature. They emphasize the spoken languages, the social sciences, and field research; they restrict themselves mainly to the modern period.

In many universities there are several centers, and arrangements such as informal seminars are often made to bring scholars together.

---

[13] For example: William Theodore DeBary (ed.), *Introduction to Oriental Civilization*, Vol. I: *Sources of the Japanese Tradition*; Vol. II: *Sources of the Indian Tradition*; Vol. III: *Sources of the Chinese Tradition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958, 1959, 1960).

[14] For further detail on the role of the foundations see Joseph Axelrod and Donald N. Bigelow, *Resources for Language and Area Studies* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1962).

[15] See Bigelow and Legters, *op. cit.*, pp. 4, 5.

This is particularly true where Russian and Chinese studies coexist in the same university. In some cases two areas are formally linked together—for example, the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University. It is not uncommon for some students to take training in both Russian and Chinese studies. The regional M.A. degree is still the most important device of the area programs. It provides language and area training for those who wish to continue to the Ph. D. and can also be used as a terminal or additional degree for students who wish to go into government or business. Those who proceed from the regional M.A. to the Ph. D. in a discipline usually spend 1 or 2 years abroad in fieldwork. The amount of credit given to regional studies in the Ph. D. program varies but is not usually more than one-fifth of the total. Because the addition of area studies to degree programs prolongs the period of study from 1 to 3 years, special financial support for such students is considered to be essential.

THE ACADEMIC OUTLOOK

The study of the non-Western world preceded and will undoubtedly outlive the language and area centers, the programs, and committees that are now the main instruments for its promotion. Eventually the non-Western world will be accepted as a natural part of the academic landscape, and those who have a special interest in it will be considered no more unusual than the exponents of American history or politics. That time has not yet come, but the main issue of acceptance is settled, and it is time to take stock of present problems and future trends in teaching and research.

The advancement of learning has never depended entirely on institutions of higher learning, but the unrestricted search for truth is one of their main functions. For the first 10 years or so after World War II, the most important theoretical research on non-Western areas was done in the universities. One of the desirable byproducts during this period was the dynamic relation between research and teaching which came about because of the newness of the field, the excitement of tackling fresh problems, and the pioneering atmosphere in the area programs. A sense of academic adventure brought professors and students together in a way not easy to emulate in more established fields.

At the same time, the relation between the universities and the government was changing because the needs of government soon outran the capacity of the universities to fulfill them. Government and government-supported research institutions absorbed large numbers of trained men who might otherwise have gone into academic work and used them to undertake research which the universities were not doing. In the long run, this development is to be welcomed. The area-trained specialists may, indeed, be partly responsible for the growing realization in government that the maker of policy must be concerned with all aspects of the lives of foreign peoples. In the eloquent words of officialdom itself:

> Not only must he be concerned with the processes of diplomacy and government, the basic physical and geographic endowments, the economic behavior, and the demographic patterns of some 200 major foreign cultures, but the policymaker must also be concerned with their social patterns and institutions, the web of religion, taboos, and myths, and the thought processes and self-images which

enter into the national style. Thus government must know what the anthropologist, linguist, and social psychologist has to say, as well as the political scientist, economist, and historian.[16]

Problems and solutions

The expansion of government-supported research on foreign areas and in such fields as contribute to strategic or defense studies can have a stimulating and challenging impact on the universities but it also raises problems. The drain of manpower to government is twofold. There are those able scholars who choose, as is their right, the life of policy and power, and there are those whose primary responsibilities are to their universities, but who contribute a certain amount of time to government as consultants. This diverts men from teaching and attracts them to policy-oriented research. In fact, the pressures of policy have done much to encourage those social scientists who are tempted by the possibility of solving international and other problems and hope that the social sciences may become policy sciences. The consequent emphasis on empirical research methods, on predictability, and practicable applicability, tended at first to widen the gap between the theoretician, as he thought of himself, and the area specialist.

There were other factors contributing to the separation between those who emphasized theory and those who specialized on specific areas. This was unfortunate because there is no basic antagonism between the two—the full development of theory depends on the accumulation of comparable data from all available sources. Yet the antagonism has been deep enough to discourage scholars, especially in sociology, social psychology, economics, and political science, from investing the time and energy necessary to apply their discipline to a specific area. Some regional experts in these disciplines, after spending many years in language and area study, have drifted back into the mainstream of theoretical involvement and have neglected their earlier work and interest.

The solution to the problem is clear. One of the main tasks of the area centers today is to find ways in which to bring together the specialized area knowledge with the "scientific" interests of the social scientist. This is a task which can only be completed with time and patience. One positive factor is the exhilarating opportunities for social scientists presented by the rapidly changing international scene. The new nations are living laboratories for the study of elite groups, of the economics of development, the transformation of value systems, the political process, urbanization—all the forces that block or promote change.

But the social sciences cannot tackle all these problems without help. To quote John M. H. Lindbeck:

> In this effort the search of the humanities in the legacies of the past for human and social values, patterns and experiences is combined with the social sciences with their orientation toward the present and future. This is becoming the special feature of area studies: a combination of studies which illuminate the particularistic and unique elements in a society (language, literature, history, religion, etc.) with the sciences of society (the social sciences). The result has been a regrouping of courses and a reorganization of research and degree requirements in order to permit the social sciences (and some fields in the humanities) to take into account the particular and unique as well as the universal elements in human experience.[17]

---

[16] U.S. Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, *External Research Report* (Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office, 1963).

[17] John M. H. Lindbeck, *Informal Comments on the "Report of the Committee on the Development of Area Studies of the University Grants Commission,"* Sept. [illegible], 1963.

It was with such considerations in mind that the Joint Committee on Contemporary China—established in 1959 by the SSRC and ACLS—when promoting studies of Communist China's economy, put their scientific direction into the hands of economists who were respected for their theoretical eminence rather than their area commitments. This was in line with the policy of making every effort to put the main responsibility for the analysis of contemporary China on the disciplines as such, leaving the theoreticians to discover the need for help from area specialists, not only in their own disciplines but also in others.

The area specialist has prepared the ground, engaged the disciplines in the study of the non-Western world, and removed many of the psychological obstacles that have long stood in the way. He has carried the burden of exploration, shown the need and the opportunities. He cannot go farther without the full support of the disciplines. Some of the new research trends seem to indicate that such support is bound to come. In this connection, the careful and thorough preparation for the study of Chinese society which was undertaken by a group of social anthropoligists, sociologists, and others during the last few years is one of the most promising of the new research trends.[18] Political scientists find that their interest in comparative politics, stimulated by the SSRC committee in that field, brings them inevitably to more and more serious study of the non-Western world.[19] As scholars in disciplines which previously were more or less culture bound ask questions about non-Western areas, they bring to area studies a salutary challenge which, if welcomed, can have far-reaching effects.

Undergraduate education

The expansion of non-Western studies in the graduate schools has also had far-reaching effects in two other fields. One of these is undergraduate education. A great deal of thought has been given to this subject by scholars, as well as by foundations and by the Government. The philosophical foundations of liberal education have come in for careful examination. Two recent examples, the report on *The College and World Affairs*, produced by a committee composed mainly of presidents of liberal arts colleges, and the Association of American Colleges' report on *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College*, both state a position which is now widely accepted. It is that undergraduates should be educated in ways that will enable them to respond intelligently to a world characterized by a plurality of cultures and pervasive change.[20] The same general idea is stated by the British University Grants Committee, in the Hayter Report, which observed: "The world has changed so much in the last 10 to 15 years, and the importance of the non-Western world has grown so fast, that the universities need to recognise this in the balance of their studies." [21]

Since the direction of research ultimately influences the content of the curriculum, it is not surprising that the graduate schools in which non-Western studies have a firm base are those in which the influence on the undergraduate curriculum has, by and large, been most extensive. But the colleges and universities which do not have graduate schools with non-Western area interests have also felt the impact. The growing demand of the liberal arts colleges for courses in non-Western areas and languages has been met by both foundations and government.

---

[18] Subcommittee on Research on Chinese Society of the Joint Committee on Contemporary China of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies.

[19] The Social Science Research Council Committee on Comparative Politics was established in 1954.

[20] See *The College and World Affairs* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964). The selective bibliography alone is impressive; also *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1964).

[21] See Great Britain, University Grants Committee, op. cit., p. 42.

International cooperation

The other effect of the expansion of non-Western studies in graduate schools has been to stimulate the awareness of the universities of their international role in matters both intellectual and practical. Scholars study and travel and attend conferences in foreign countries to an extent that no one could have anticipated 20 years ago. What is new is the amount of intellectual communication and even cooperation with non-Western countries as a result, largely, of the high motivation of the universities. This wave of interest, which has made possible some modest investments by government and foundations in the intellectual life of non-Western countries, has also made possible what has been called an impressive partnership between the government and the universities to carry out our foreign assistance effort. If this has helped to increase general university awareness of the problems of non-Western societies, it has also put tremendous strains on the academic quality of non-Western area research.[22] A whole new dimension had to be absorbed. Universities had to move on every front at the same time—languages, disciplines, curriculum, libraries, teaching materials, and financial support—at a time when the need for non-Western studies was long overdue and growing with increasing urgency. All this put a tremendous strain on the integrity and the facilities of higher education.

There is only one conclusion after taking stock. It is time to pay attention to the academic heart of the area approach to non-Western studies. It is perhaps possible today to bring to fruition the early dream because of the developments of the last few years. There is perhaps more general acceptance that the attempt to see a society whole is not unique to area studies and that the techniques for this highly sophisticated approach can only be forged when the disciplines are fully engaged. Area studies have been trying to develop techniques of interdisciplinary cooperation without the help of many disciplines of critical importance and in fields where data, let alone comparable data, were most difficult to secure.[23] Now that more disciplines are involved and libraries have been built up, scholars trained, and the results of field work accumulated, it is time to return to the basic academic problem. This is the scientific problem of what contribution the study of non-Western societies can make to the theoretical development of the disciplines. ("The Non-Western World in Higher Education," the *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1964.)

---

[22] See John W. Gardner, "AID and the Universities," report to the Administrator of the Agency for International Development (Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development, 1964), for a penetrating and provocative discussion.

[23] For a stimulating discussion of the relation between law and area studies see Dan Fenno Henderson, "International Legal Studies and University Foreign Area Studies" (American Society of International Law, Conference on the Teaching of International and Foreign Law, June 24, 1964).

NDEA Language and Area Centers

by Donald N. Bigelow and Lyman H. Legters

In a report issued in 1964 by the Office of Education an assessment was made of the impact of the first 5 years of the NDEA language and area centers program on non-Western studies. Mr. Bigelow is Acting Director, Division of Education Personnel Training, Office of Education; Mr. Legters, formerly with the Office of Education, is visiting professor of Russian Affairs at the Sino-Soviet Institute, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

The vigorous pursuit of non-Western studies in our colleges and universities began in the post-World War II period, during which the involvement of the United States in global affairs reached a new level of intensity and impressed itself more clearly on the consciousness of most Americans. It was no coincidence that the resulting academic absorption in non-Western subject matter became identified with the area studies approach to the curriculum. The area approach—although developed before 1941—had first been widely adopted in wartime in response to a sudden realization of the need for training in the understanding of alien societies and cultures, a need that, under the circumstances, could be met only by combining rare skills from among several disciplines. Similar postwar needs, which found the country scarcely better prepared, suggested a continuation of the approach that had lately revealed such promise.

ACADEMIC ANTECEDENTS OF AREA STUDIES

The constituent elements of the area study concept as it relates to NDEA—non-Western emphasis, application of varied disciplinary skills, contemporary focus, concern for total societies and cultures, field study, and language proficiency (the most important postwar addition to the concept)—all have their antecedents in American academic tradition.

Non-Western studies * have long had scholarly devotees. Sinologists, Indologists (or Sanskritists), and Arabists have always played a role in the academic world. They have traditionally been the scholars who studied, partly out of interest and partly for lack of colleagues, the totality of those cultures and civilizations. Stemming, however, largely from the fields of classical language and literature, archeology, and the history of art or religion, they did not typically apply the insights of social science or manifest the interest in contemporary developments which have come to be associated with area studies. And they were usually not concerned with the modern languages spoken in their areas.

---

*Defined as including Latin America and Eastern Europe because these areas share the contemporary problems of social and economic development of the geographically non-Western world and because they have resided outside the mainstream of American academic attention.

A parallel case is that of the classicists, long a mainstay of the curriculum of American higher education. Likewise noncontemporary in focus but not of course associated with the non-Western world, classicists have commonly embraced the whole of a civilization as their subject. This they did before the present-day departments had fully established themselves and thus accomplished the seemingly definitive division of knowledge along disciplinary lines. Such specialists necessarily embodied classical language proficiency in their approach, either because their subjects were literary or because they required access to sources in the so-called exotic languages. Field study was often just as necessary, most obviously so in the case of archeology; but it was never contemporary in emphasis and thus seldom involved an encounter with either a modern society or its languages.

With the emergence of anthropology, both field study and language skill received new impetus. Anthropology achieved recognition as an academic discipline during the last part of the 19th century and acquired departmental status on many campuses in the 20th. It became *par excellence* the exponent of fieldwork and oral communication. Furthermore, many of its favorite topics for investigation were located in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Still, anthropology was only secondarily concerned with modern industrial societies and cultures and usually concentrated on primitive groups remote from the contemporary global arena.

This concentration, as it manifested itself in anthropological study of the American Indians, had an additional significance for the subsequent emergence of language and area studies. For the resulting attention to Indian dialects gave rise to an American school of structural linguistics which has played a central role in the postwar flowering of language learning in the context of non-Western studies.

Such fields as comparative government, international relations, and the economics of foreign trade were accustomed, on the other hand, to concentrate on contemporary subjects, but paid relatively little attention to the non-Western world. And language teachers, though manifestly concerned with proficiency in their subject, also gave the bulk of their attention to the European or "common" languages: Latin, French, German, Spanish, and Italian.

Perhaps the most pointed antecedents of all were the handful of area programs which existed before World War II. One or two modest programs started as early as the World War I era, with Latin America the most prominent area of study. By the early 1930s’, however, there were distinctive programs of area research, notably those originated by W. Norman Brown (University of Pennsylvania) on South Asia, Raymond A. Kennedy (Yale University) on southeast Asia, and Philip K. Hitti (Princeton University) on the Middle East. These and others that evolved before World War II typified the aim of integrating disciplinary viewpoints to provide more comprehensive understanding of non-Western regions or localities.

AREA STUDIES IN THE POSTWAR CURRICULUM

Despite the many precedents for the constituent elements of the area approach, the emergence of area studies on a broad scale in the postwar period was seen as a challenge to traditional departmental organization. Certain of the more enthusiastic proponents of area studies regarded the new fashion as a replacement for the accepted disciplines, a view which evoked a correspondingly extreme reaction among traditionalists. The ensuing debate over the validity and merits of the area approach, even now not fully resolved in the academic community, tended, therefore, to be irrelevant to the actual area programs that finally found their place in the major universities. For the more moderate proponents of area studies saw in the programs they initiated merely a device for supplementing departmental offerings and making a comprehensive attack on hitherto neglected non-Western subject matter in such a manner as to repair existing shortcomings as rapidly and easily as possible.

These moderates pointed out that the disciplines, the so-called vertical pillars of knowledge, left "twilight zones and vales of complete ignorance" between them. Area focus, said Robert B. Hall, chairman of the Committee on World Area Research, would "not only help to fill the now unknown interstices, but also bring about an exchange of the particular knowledge and peculiar insights of the different disciplines, to the general enrichment of research." When it was conceded that area work lacked the "hard core" and specific methodology by which it could challenge the disciplines on their own ground, it became apparent that the real argument turned neither on the appropriate way of carving up knowledge nor on the presumed benefits in the realm of research. Rather, the important question concerned the manner in which departments could be interrelated within a university structure to produce a set of integrated course offerings focusing on a specific world region.

The area programs which emerged in the late 1940's and 1950's represented varying patterns of organization. The most rudimentary type was a collection of courses bearing on a particular world area and already offered in the various departments. From within the elaborate curriculums of the larger universities it was often easy to obtain professors from as many as half a dozen departments whose courses dealt in whole or in part with a single global area. In such cases, there might be a single interested faculty member responsible for whatever integration and student guidance were provided. Or there might be a more formal structuring, with a committee representing and mediating among the several disciplines. But such combinations of existing courses seldom achieved more than separate listings by world area in the institution's catalog: the possibility of developing any systematic or professional approach to area studies was usually ignored.

Other area programs, some dating from the prewar period, were aimed primarily at undergraduates and took the form of an integrated course on a non-Western area—a single major country such as India or China, or a world region as large as Asia. Among the better known examples that could be cited are the University of Chicago program in non-Western civilizations and the University of Michigan course on Asia for undergraduates. Such courses would be taught by teams of faculty members from the various disciplines which happened to be represented. They necessitated coordination, often to the extent of evolving collaborative textbooks and other course materials, and were frequently offered with great enthusiasm by the instructors who taught them.

Still another version of the area approach was the formation of separate institutes or "centers" to deal with one or another world area, as exemplified by the several institutes at Columbia University. A large measure of administrative autonomy was necessary to enable a director and his staff to attain a high level of research and graduate instruction. The faculty had to be cohesive and distinguished enough to attract students. Such programs did not ordinarily compete in any functional way with the academic departments. On the contrary, except for a few purely research centers, the faculty and students customarily maintained their departmental ties. However, this type of structure permitted a certain amount of influence on faculty recruitment so that area gaps might also be considered when departmental vacancies were being filled. As this system gradually took hold, faculty appointments became joint ventures and students had increasingly to fulfill the requirements of both the department and the area center.

A final organizational form, more conventional in the sense that most programs so organized were of long standing, was the department built around an area focus, such as the Department of Oriental Studies at Princeton University or the Department of Near Eastern Studies at the University of Michigan. In such cases historians and, more rarely, social scientists might be found along with language and literature specialists in a single department functioning in the same manner as a department consisting of a homogeneous discipline. Comparatively few new programs copied this arrangement, but some of the older ones which had proved workable on this basis retained the departmental form.

All of these organizational devices, along with further variants, served the purpose of area studies through the 1950's. During this decade several trends were apparent. A growing body of faculty members became identified with the various centers of non-Western studies, fostering a distinctive professional focus of both research and instruction but also maintaining the traditional disciplinary credentials and enjoying equality of status in the academic community. Programs of study, particularly for higher degrees, grew noticeably longer as students had to satisfy both departmental and area requirements while at the same time acquiring the language skills enabling them to work in their area effectively. The area concept became more firmly rooted in the curriculum of higher education as the high caliber of its results gradually overcame the residual opposition to any crossing of departmental lines.

Throughout this period and into the 1960's, the granting of degrees was increasingly acknowledged to be a departmental prerogative. Except for the so-called area departments, which retained their regular degree-granting functions, most area studies programs deferred to the disciplines on this score, and the area Ph. D. almost disappeared. While the A.B. and M.A. in area fields remained more common, even at these levels the area programs contented themselves more often than not with the maintenance of the requirements for an area specialization within the framework of a degree in one of the disciplines. The balance that was being struck in this respect satisfied all concerned, especially as it also simplified the problem of placement for graduates who might otherwise have been handicapped by an unconventional, nondepartmental degree.

If any objection to the area concept was left unanswered, it concerned sources of funds. The traditionalists' initial fear that area programs would drain budgetary support away from the departments abated in the face of strong foundation support for non-Western studies. Although the departments might envy the area centers such support, university funds themselves were not diverted to any unreasonable extent. Indeed, just because of this arrangement, it was the area programs, with their comparatively weak claim on university resources, that were in the long run left in a financially precarious position. In practice, however, the personnel of departments and area centers overlapped to such an extent that the issue of source of support was less critical than expected. The sphere of neglect that did appear lay elsewhere—in the disciplines not associated with area programs, particularly in the language departments. These were becoming increasingly aware of both their stake in, and their potential contribution to, area instruction.

THE GROWTH OF AREA STUDIES PROGRAMS

In the period from 1946 to 1962 several surveys were conducted to determine the number of area programs in operation at a given time. Certain of these surveys also explored the standards by which area programs could be defined. The first was undertaken in 1946 by Robert B. Hall under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council. Excluding the programs dealing with North American and European areas, he listed 22 universities with 45 instructional programs either in operation or planned. Of the active programs, more were aimed at undergraduates than at graduate students. At that time, regional ranking placed Latin America (16), the Far East (14), and Russia and Eastern Europe (11) far in the lead.

By 1951 it was possible for the next surveyor, Wendell C. Bennett, in his studies for the Social Science Research Council, to apply more qualitative distinctions on the basis of the 5 years' intervening experience and to identify the solidly grounded undertakings. The concept of an "integrated area program" which he used has since been employed in the Department of State surveys to identify organized and well-planned programs and exclude mere collections of course offerings. The criteria Bennett proposed were:

1. Official university recognition and support of the program;
2. Adequate library resources both for teaching and for research on the area;
3. Competent instruction in the principal languages of the area;
4. Offerings in at least 5 pertinent subjects in addition to language instruction;
5. Some specific mechanisms for integrating the area studies;
6. An area research program;
7. Emphasis on the contemporary aspects of the area.

Except for the fifth criterion, these characteristics avoided the more problematical aspects of integration in either area instruction or area research. The delimitation of a geographical area does not, of course, provide any automatic integrating principle. As far as area research is concerned, integration is usually achieved by focusing the relevant disciplinary viewpoints on a particular problem that is significant in the context of a global area or region. In the instructional realm, as Sidney Mintz observed in his survey for the Human Relations Area Files in New Haven, integration may occur in essentially two ways:

By bringing diverse disciplinary approaches to bear on an area problem in the presence of students, thereby exposing them to a variety of disciplinary treatments of area subject matter and permitting integration to take place in their minds; and by collaborative multidisciplinary preparation of text material to be presented in integrated form by practitioners of the several pertinent disciplines. Both of these approaches have been used successfully, singly or in combination, and were presumably the mechanisms intended in Bennett's fifth point, although his enumeration as a whole referred rather to planning, coordination, and the permanence of institutional commitment. These more visible characteristics enabled Bennett and others who surveyed the field to rule out the more ephemeral area programs and provide a rough index of growth in the serious adoption of the area studies approach in American higher education.

Excluding the European programs, Bennett found 25 integrated area programs in operation and 19 potential (planned or incipient) programs, with the following global distribution:

Area	Integrated programs	Potential programs
Russia	5	3
Far East	8	3
Southeast Asia	2	1
South Asia	1	2
Near East	2	4
Africa	1	0
Latin America	6	6
Total	25	19

The number of faculty personnel engaged in area instruction reflected the leading position of the Far Eastern, Russian, and Latin American programs; but in numbers of students the Latin American programs were a poor third, well out of proportion to the number of centers and faculty.

The 28 universities covered by Bennett's survey reported an impressive range of language offerings and enrollments but, except for Spanish, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese, advanced instruction in language was scanty and not well distributed. Offerings and enrollments in the less common languages were limited. Language study had not kept pace with the development of area instruction despite nearly universal recognition of the vital importance of language proficiency in area specialization.

Bennett's findings were particularly significant with respect to the degree of involvement of the several disciplines in area programs, and they merit recapitulation. Anthropology was poorly represented in programs dealing with Russia, the Near East, and South Asia, but strong in areas where "primitive" people still resided. Art specialists played a major role only in Far Eastern studies. Economics was especially deficient in programs on Southeast Asia, south Asia, the Near East, and Africa. The study of education had only potential value for area programs. Geography, "though presumably one of the basic subjects of area study," was poorly represented for nearly all areas. While history was basic to many programs, it was deficient for southeast Asia, south Asia, and Africa. International relations provided few specialists in any area. Law was generally unrepresented in all areas. Literature was strong in all but southeast and south Asian studies. Philosophy was seldom represented. Political science was weakest in its contribution to southeast Asian, south Asian, Near Eastern, and African programs. Psychology was found to be "an important field which is not yet involved in area studies." Sociology was needed everywhere, but particularly in Near Eastern and African studies.

The Department of State issued reports on area study programs in three successive editions (1954, 1956, 1959) under the title *Area Study Programs in American Universities;* a further revision entitled *Language and Area Study Programs in American Universities* was produced in 1962; and a revised and augmented edition [appeared] in 1964. Limited by what institutions report and by uncertainty as to what programs should be included, these State Department reports still provide the best indication of higher education's growing acceptance of the area approach to non-Western studies. Their findings are summarized in the following table.

Region	Number of programs [1]			
	1954	1956	1959	1962
Africa	3	6	6	13
Asia (general)	10	24	6	16
			(23)	(28)
East Asia			17	12
Southeast Asia	4	9	12	14
	(10)	(15)		
South Asia	6	6		
Latin America	11	28	199	2
Near East	7	12	13	18
Soviet Union and East Europe	14	23	19	34
Total	55	108	92	136

[1] Certain editions combined areas that were listed separately in other editions. Figures in parentheses in the table are supplied for purposes of comparison.

Despite certain fluctuations, the general pattern of growth is apparent. Among the subsidiary tendencies, the marked rise in African and Latin American programs should occasion no surprise. Nor is the continued dominance of Far Eastern and Russian and East European programs unexpected. Within individual programs, the State Department surveys showed significant growth not only in the availability of language instruction but also in the strength and variety of disciplinary representation.

The opportunities for such notable growth were provided in large measure by the foundations. * * * With the Rockefeller Foundation taking the lead in 1933, followed by Carnegie and then by Ford (on a large scale after 1951), foundation support allowed for the development of academic instruction organized on an area basis. These efforts were decisive in assisting the universities to surmount their previous neglect of the non-Western world. While there is no doubt that area programs have won acceptance in the academic community since the 1950's, there is also no doubt that area studies would have died at birth had such continued support not been forthcoming.

THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

The outstanding weakness in the area approach by the end of the 1950's was in language instruction. Most languages which were offered were taught with less than optimum effectiveness, owing partly to scarcity of teachers and partly to lack of instructional materials. Many important languages were not taught at all. What had been accomplished in the non-Western languages had been the work of a few leading scholars starting before World War II. The war indicated both the importance of what had been started and the inadequacy of the effort up to that time. Yet as late as 1958 many students otherwise qualified as area specialists were graduating without language proficiency adequate for either fieldwork in their areas or satisfactory library research at home.

Nevertheless, the vital place of language in area studies had become clear. The addition of the word "language" to the title of the area program survey made by the Department of State in 1962 was symbolic of this recognition. Despite shortcomings in practice, it was recognized in theory that indigenous languages were essential for area specialists, whether social scientists or humanists. If there were exceptions, they involved Africa and southeast Asia where the methods of descriptive linguistics were often advocated as a key to the multitude of indigenous languages, either instead of, or as a supplement to, the learning of one or two uncommon languages that might or might not prove useful in an individual's research. The same two exceptions also pointed up the importance of the common languages—such as English, French, German, and Italian—in non-Western studies.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE CENTER CONCEPT

It was generally accepted by the late 1950's that language and area studies could not, and should not, attempt to supplant the disciplines. Each of the several related disciplines had a unique contribution that could be realized only if its separate identity and character were retained. As a device for organizing curricular offerings pertinent to a given world area and for assisting the student to become an area specialist, the language and area center was recognized as a focal point for these various skills and viewpoints.

The undergraduate might be offered only an introduction to an alien culture through an integrated area course. Or he might be prepared in more comprehensive fashion by higher levels of specialization leading to graduate study. The master's degree might be earned in an area field; it was sometimes retained as a useful device, particularly for students with nonacademic career goals such as government service or international commercial activity. But the doctorate was almost universally granted on a departmental basis with concentration on the candidate's chosen area.

While the dispersion of authority and direction among departments often imposed difficulties on the administration of language and area centers, it allowed specialized talent recruited for the center's immediate purposes to be incorporated into the traditional departmental structure. In the words of a report prepared by the South Asian Language and Area Center of the University of Chicago, it assured "that center development is at every point rooted in the normal university structure." The supporting conviction of that faculty was that language and area studies "are best pursued, not as a field independent of the usual academic disciplines, but rather through specialization in one or two disciplines, which may be applied to the area."

The report of the Conference on Japanese and American Studies, held in Ann Arbor, Mich., in May 1963, emphasized a similar concept of area studies as "an association among disciplines for their mutual gain." The effect of center-style organization of instruction and research, the report stated, "is to make the area specialist aware of the important actual or potential contribution of other fields of learning to problems that are of interest in his own discipine, at the same time that he learns to apply his own discipline's viewpoint and methods to a chosen world area."

The area specialist, a faculty member belonging at once to a department and a language and area center, has emerged as a bridge between these two complementary forms of academic organization. Whether in research or teaching, he is the agent of fruitful and mutually strengthening interaction between his discipline and his area concentration. He is the logical outcome of a center concept that harmonizes rather than competes with customary university structure and mode of operation.

As already stated elsewhere . . . , "The center concept can no longer be regarded as an esoteric matter; it has entered the national scene, not only because of the NDEA but because of its immediate relevance to higher education." The relevance of centers extends further, however, for they are reservoirs of knowledge and skills needed by the community and the country. They offer unique competence in advice and leadership to neighboring institutions, in programs open to community participation, and in specialized knowledge at the service of the Nation in its overseas commitments and relations. All this is in keeping with the American academic tradition of community service." ("Language and Area Centers: First 5 Years.")

Colgate University

*by Theodore Herman**

Mr. Herman, who is associate professor and chairman of the Department of Government at Colgate University, contributed a report on Asian studies at his university to "Asian Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges," published in 1961 by the Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Colgate is typical of a large number of liberal arts colleges whose students have a reasonably good cultural background and most of whom can become excited occasionally by experiences that touch the mind or the spirit. Colgate may or may not also be typical in already using its Asia-trained faculty as fully as possible for Asian studies courses until it is today unable to capitalize any further on the student interest aroused. But it is because of this very real impasse that the university is now seeking to develop additional approaches that may be within its limited means.

To an unusual extent our total educational program is already directed toward areas outside the United States. The university has, however, long had a special concern for Asia that makes it quick to support the interest in that area that is so steadily growing in this country. This interest is not mainly for political or strategic understanding, important as Asia is in today's world. Rather it is that for their own unique achievements the many cultures of Asia have great contributions to make to Americans who aspire to be truly educated and hence responsible citizens in this century. Every area, including the Arctic, is strategic. Asia has more to offer than the facts of its location.

If knowledge in this direction is worthwhile, how can more undergraduates acquire some of it? At this point, the problems of facilities and costs, of faculty attached to regular departments, of library, income and many other mundate details that plague the modestly financed colleges and universities of this country must be considered. Colgate is a private liberal arts college in rural, upstate New York, trying hard to make ends meet around some 1350 men students. To do so the university has declared an almost total ban on adding any more faculty or courses. In addition, the normal curriculum is stretched thin by an extensive general education program together with the beginnings of independent study. The faculty organizes the curriculum in this way because to them it seems educationally sound and exciting, but these circumstances are sometimes difficult for area specialists when only a limited number of students enroll in their favorite courses. Such hazards no doubt keep many Asian and other foreign area specialists from accepting appointments at the smaller institutions or staying long if they start out there.

---

*© 1961, Association of American Colleges.

For a number of years Colgate has offered half a dozen courses on various parts of Asia in area studies, geography, modern history, religion and now in art. These are taught, with only one exception, by individuals who have lived in their respective areas and all of whom maintain their academic interest in them. Each year some 70 or 80 students, or 5 percent of the total student body, take at least one of the Asian studies courses within a departmental concentration or as an elective. The largest group of students exposed to Asia is in area studies where, up to the present, only China is covered.

Colgate does not have an Asian studies concentration or major, since it would be far too diffuse academically, but an outstanding student with good background can do an independent study project under an Asian area specialist in the latter's own department. Thus an effort is made to remain flexible in order to feed the interest of students in several directions. If such demands were many, the faculty would obviously be further strained.

While the addition of more new courses has been virtually banned, some of the faculty, in normal academic fashion, are seriously discussing the addition of 2 years of Chinese language, plus either Asian literature or Chinese history. These faculty members feel that there is real student interest already and that there is a need to interest more students. They are also tempted by the possibility of getting half the cost of the language instruction met through the National Defense Education Act. Against this attraction are such strong arguments as the unknown source of the rest of the funds needed, the admittedly small number of students and the competition for enrollments against the other foreign languages already offered. Such objections are very real and Colgate is not, to be sure, alone in trying to face them. Indeed not to do so is to shut one's eyes to the nationwide need for more training in the "neglected" languages at the undergraduate level or even earlier. We have certainly not found the answer in view of our limitations, one of which is even trying to find a faculty member with enough spare time to promote the interest and to search for the funds each year.

Colgate has therefore been considering other approaches to developing an interest in Asia among its students. The first approach is, in a sense, one of two somewhat different approaches apparently being tried by many institutions. Some colleges seem to be relying primarily on already trained faculty in Asian studies, many of whom have lived in Asia for several years; other colleges, not having such individuals, are trying to persuade likely faculty members to undergo retraining—often on their own time. While retraining is more difficult, even with a dedicated faculty member, helpful colleagues and farsighted administrators, there are some pressing reasons why such efforts should be encouraged. This is a formative and rapidly expanding period in Asian studies, so that even to arouse student interest at the undergraduate level with less than full expertise, is worthwhile. The rapidly expanding graduate programs in Asian studies at American universities can take many more students than at present in these circumstances; the undergraduate colleges have an important role in creating such students.

While Colgate has on its faculty some persons trained in the Asian field, the first approach toward expansion of faculty interest in the field emphasizes retraining. This approach is indirect, somewhat in line with the National Defense Education Act summer institutes for teachers in many fields, and might not add much to present costs. It is a matter of discovering that since Asia will not come to Colgate, Colgate had better go to Asia. As originally proposed by one of the faculty to a private source, we should like to give at least 12 of our faculty members some specialized training on Asia in their own subject. This would require concentrated study in recognized Asian studies programs of American universities for 7 to 8 months, followed by fieldwork in an Asian country for 5 or 6 months. The program would be in the individual's own discipline, and abroad he would be in touch with scholars and other key people related to his project. Physical scientists as well as faculty members in the humanities and the social sciences would be included. There would be no age, language, or publication requirements.

The rationale of this proposal rests on three premises: (1) that the specialist with intensive preparation can use his time abroad with maximum effectiveness; (2) that instead of returning to set up new courses he would bring Asian materials, problems and insights into his present courses; and (3) that in this manner some of the reality of life in Asia would become part of the normal framework of American academic experience. Admittedly this scheme assumes a number of characteristics in all concerned, including recognition by the institution that its main interest is in teaching. Yet the scheme is not at all farfetched when one recalls how deeply American higher education has been influenced in the classroom by several generations of scholars who, in the 19th and early 20th centuries, supplemented their training by further study in Europe. Asia's riches are certainly no less.

This method is, in Colgate's view, a much sounder way to orient faculty members in depth than by exposing them to lectures by occasional visiting specialists or even by several terms of study in this country *without* a period of work in Asia. That serious postgraduate area training of established faculty can be fruitful is shown on our campus by two men who gained it in the past 3 years, one at Harvard in Asian art and the other in Africa in political science. As a result they have set up new courses which are so creative and dynamic that students from many departments have ventured into them. The seminar for college teachers in Hyderabad, scheduled for the summer of 1961 under the United States Educational Foundation in India, is a good if limited step in this same direction. Fortunately, Colgate will have one of its own philosophy faculty studying in that group, so that there will be an opportunity for us to evaluate his experience as he builds it into his regular courses.

Our second way of making Asia a part of the normal experience of educated persons is to bring specialists, artists, exhibitions and films to the campus, with effective publicity. Hence the university looks forward to sharing in the recently organized tours of Asian performers under the auspices of the Asia Society of New York. This project is a real boon to colleges off the beaten track, and Colgate welcomes it heartily.

The third approach is much more nebulous but even more fundamental. It recognizes that most American education is overwhelmingly Western directed. This emphasis runs right through the precollege years, and, for most students, through their college years as well. Yet when the students emerge, the professors exclaim how inadequately equipped they are to know the roots of their own tradition. The inference from this is that it is impossible to look into non-Western cultures with any profit. Often to faculty members in Asian studies there is something of the self-perpetuating vested interest in this view—the vested interest of teachers and scholars who themselves have had no substantial contact with other cultures and have no incentive to gain it. For whether one likes it or not, the world is full of people who have entirely different traditions from the Western and with whom it becomes more and more important that Americans *do* learn to live.

At Colgate the faculty in this field sometimes wonders—especially near the end of a long, gray winter—if an effort should be made to require that every student take a standard general cultures course that would include Asia or a compulsory elective from among several Asian courses. The problems are obvious: to offer solid content and to find competent staff. Additionally, the specialists on Africa and Latin America, plus those whose light gleams only from Hellas, Latium, or points west, will clamor for a place in the sun on the same count. While the wise administrator will do well to retreat from this noisy field, the question remains: Can a hierarchy of places and cultures ever be established and on what basis—numbers of people, age of tradition, continuity of tradition, distance from the United States, size of spaceship fleet?

Perhaps the answer depends on the discipline. Or perhaps someone, somewhere, should try to condense and improve the interminable high school history courses, as is being done with mathematics, the sciences and foreign languages, so that a full term in the secondary school could be released for studying *one* of the vital cultures of Asia. This might be an area course that includes substantial student work projects and that constantly makes comparisons with the student's own culture. This goal is very far in the future, for in how many schools are there the teachers, the libraries, or even the texts, although teachers are always asking for such an Aladin's lamp? Would a high school course meet the need? Of course it would not. But one would expect it, if well done, to stimulate the need at the college level, as students would seek to learn more about Asia.

By this last suggestion it should be apparent that we have no single solution as the faculty in Asian studies continues to compete in the market place of free electives against such popular fields as American history, American literature, and American economics. Indeed the undergraduate effort must eventually include four kinds of contact: (1) General area studies, preferably of one Asian country or culture area; (2) Asian-oriented courses in several of the regular departments; (3) more inclusion of Asian materials and viewpoints in existing general courses; and (4) an Asian language for speaking and simple reading and writing. Colgate is considering and ultimately hopes to be able to move on all these fronts where it has not already made a beginning.

Finally, where do the interests of our students in Asia lead? A few are going on to graduate school in Asian studies, although there would no doubt be more if we offered an Asian language. Almost none visit

Asia or work for employers (aside from the Government) that send them to Asia—reflecting to some degree the lack of language and perhaps Eastern United States provincialism as well. Some do continue their interest in Asian art, philosophy and current developments, and hopefully they are better equipped to assess America's relations with that part of the world. Since these things are all to the good, Colgate's faculty in Asian studies continues to chip away to the extent of its resources at making more students acquainted with some of Asia's riches. However limited these resources may be and however frustrating the task, this seems eminently worth doing. (*Asian Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges.*)

The State University College at New Paltz, N.Y.

*by the Commission on International Understanding, Association of American Colleges**

In a lengthy appendix to its 1962–64 survey of non-Western studies in the liberal arts colleges, the Commission on International Understanding of the Association of American Colleges included a number of case studies of individual colleges and groups of institutions.

The State University College at New Paltz, N.Y.,[1] has been a pioneer in requiring non-Western studies as part of the general education of all candidates for the bachelor's degree. New Paltz has also introduced many non-Western courses at the junior-senior level and majors on Africa and Asia. President William J. Haggerty has provided vigorous leadership for an institution-wide effort to develop a faculty and curriculum which would assure that no student could graduate unless he had taken at least four courses dealing with non-Western cultures. This has been achieved without special financial aid. New Paltz has assembled some 25 specialists on one or more non-Western areas. Twenty members of the faculty in 1963–64 had been born and raised in a non-Western area and had had advanced academic training in the West.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

New Paltz is a former State teachers college which was one of several such institutions incorporated into the State University of New York when it was organized in 1948. President Haggerty was inaugurated in 1944, 6 years after New Paltz became a 4-year college. He has helped to introduce many changes in the curriculum, with a growing emphasis on solid disciplinary content. The entire program is now based on general education in the liberal arts, including required introductory courses on non-Western areas, followed by academic majors. The first minor in liberal arts was introduced in 1948. Two of the elective courses in this minor were history of the Far East, and Asia in modern times. These were taught by teachers without special qualifications or firsthand experience in the Orient.

Non-Western studies at New Paltz really began with the introduction of the revised curriculum in 1957, partly as a result of President Haggerty's service during 1952–53 as chief educational adviser to the Government of India for the U.S. technical assistance program. Dr. Haggerty returned determined to provide a better education for world understanding than the Western-oriented curriculum at New Paltz. A few influential members of the faculty, such as the chairman of the division of education, who had served the World Health Organization in Taiwan, and professors who had severally taught in India, Iran, Japan, Lebanon, and Thailand, were ready to support efforts to "globalize the curriculum."

---

*© 1964, Association of American Colleges.

[1] The State University College at New Platz, N.Y. President William J. Haggerty. (State; coeducational; quarter system; liberal arts and teacher training to master's degree; 3,453 students.)

Two preliminary steps were taken in 1955 and 1956 to promote world understanding among the faculty and students of the college and in the surrounding area. The first consisted of a series of television programs which began in 1955 and continued for several years. The initial series was called "Know Your Neighbors" and focused on understanding other peoples. The second series dealt with India and the third with Asia.

Secondly, at commencement time in 1956, Humayun Kabir, Minister of Scientific and Cultural Affairs in the Government of India, dedicated a World Study Center in the college library. At the center there are displays and collections of books, periodicals, pamphlets, films, pictures, artifacts, slides and maps dealing with all parts of the world but especially with Africa and Asia. By 1963 the center had over 6,000 items and received some 300 periodicals annually. It is widely used by students, teachers and others in the mid-Hudson region. The center has published a few booklets and study guides on non-Western countries, such as Afghanistan and Thailand.

The curriculum committee made a study in 1956–57, concluding with recommendations for broadening the pattern of teacher education in two ways. The first was to provide a 2-year required general education program for the freshman and sophomore years. The second was to develop an academic major of 24 semester-credit hours in the liberal arts (increased to 54 quarter units in 1963) which every student would take in addition to his professional training. This new curriculum provided fewer electives and more required courses stressing important concepts and interrelationships in various disciplines, with at least 15 credit hours in science and mathematics for each student, and tried wherever possible to present all subjects in a worldwide frame of reference. *Every student was required to take a course in Asian civilization and one on Africa and the Near East.* A faculty with special skills and interests was essential to such a curriculum.

ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

President Haggerty and his senior associates have consistently tried to strengthen the faculty. Their success may be gaged by the fact that between 1951 and 1956 four members of the faculty won fund for the advancement of education faculty fellowships for their outstanding teaching ability in liberal education. While Prof. Willard N. Hogan had received a grant to work on revision of the U.N. Charter at the Brookings Institution in 1952, and three members of the staff had received Fulbright appointments to India (2) and Japan (1) during these years, New Paltz did not have any specialists on the non-Western world before the new curriculum was recommended.

The college has strengthened its faculty resources in relation to the non-Western world by two chief means. First, it has recruited teachers with special competence in non-Western areas. Second, it has encouraged existing faculty members to seek Fulbright Awards and other opportunities to study or serve in non-Western countries.

Recruitment of scholars with area specialization has been facilitated since the administration introduced a new criterion to faculty appointment after 1957. It provided that as between two or more candidates of equal merit preference was to be given to the one who had the most significant international experience relevant to the college's needs.

This policy has led to the appointment of 20 members of the faculty who are natives of a non-Western area dealt with in the curriculum. Normally these teachers are responsible for instruction in regular courses in their disciplines and also teach a course or two relating to the non-Western world. These faculty members include 11 in social sciences, 7 in the humanities, and 1 each in art and education. Fourteen of the twenty earned at least their first degree in a non-Western country before taking advanced degrees in this country. Four others completed all of their higher education in the United States. The two remaining foreign-born faculty members earned their advanced degrees in European universities. All of these teachers have had considerable graduate study or teaching experience in the United States, in addition to their non-Western training.

The dean and his colleagues at New Paltz learned that it is important for every teacher in an American college to have a thorough understanding of the Western tradition and the American cultural heritage even if he is instructing students in courses dealing exclusively with a non-Western society. This explains why particular care is taken in reviewing candidates for the faculty from non-Western countries, and why most of those appointed combine advanced training and research at American universities with education in their own lands. The administration has found that, if problems of acculturation and adjustment for teachers from non-Western countries are surmounted by careful planning and good will, these teachers can add important dimensions to the intellectual and social life of the college.

In recent years nine members of the faculty have won Fulbright Awards to lecture or engage in research in India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Pakistan, and Thailand. These awards have gone to members of the divisions of the arts, education, humanities, and the social sciences, including the chairmen of the last two divisions. President Haggerty took part in educational missions to India in 1961 and 1963. Dean Pyle participated in a special study group on India during 1962–63. A member of the music faculty took part in a Fulbright summer seminar in India in 1962. Other arrangements have taken staff members as visiting professors, researchers or consultants to such places as the American University of Beirut, teacher training colleges in Indonesia, and the University College of Rhodesia.

By these various means at least 36 members of the administration and faculty have acquired substantial experience in one or more non-Western areas. As a college with an expanding enrollment, New Paltz has had to enlarge its faculty considerably in recent years. This has facilitated its employment of specially qualified instructors for required and elective courses on the non-Western world. The growing competence of the faculty in non-Western areas has been reflected in the curriculum at many points.

CURRICULUM

The curriculum committee is responsible as part of its broader functions for the development of international and non-Western studies. The dean of the college serves on the committee along with representatives of the divisions of the arts, humanities, sciences and social sciences. The chairmen of the divisions of the humanities and the social sciences, and the director of liberal studies, to whom they report, have general administrative responsibility for non-Western area studies and for the majors in international relations (introduced in 1957) and in African or Asian studies (inaugurated in 1962).

The introduction in 1957 of a major in international relations and of the two required general education courses on Asian civilizations and on Africa and the Near East was the start of a continuing growth of non-Western studies. The regular addition of new teachers with special qualifications to teach about non-Western areas, and the gradual extension of competence to such areas by other members of the faculty combined to provide the human resources and interest out of which these curricular changes have developed.

By the academic year 1963-64, 29 additional courses relating to the non-Western world had become part of the curriculum. Fourteen of these were disciplinary courses dealing primarily with one or more non-Western cultures. Five represented 2 years of instruction in Chinese and 3 in Russian language, offered for the first time in 1961 and 1962 respectively. The remaining 10 were courses of the infusion type dealing in part with non-Western areas. Two of this last group of offerings, art and culture, and world literature including Kalidasa's *Shakuntala* and Murasaki's *The Tales of Genji*, were also required. This makes a total of four mandatory courses in general education relating to the non-Western world, an exceptional set of requirements for a liberal arts college.

Teachers at New Paltz have wrestled with the issues involved in choosing the most effective approach to general education courses on non-Western areas. By 1962 those teaching the semester course on Africa and the Near East had arrived at a consensus that their needs would be met best by a multidisciplinary approach. Dr. Ahmad Haffar, assistant professor of Near Eastern studies, has described certain aspects of the New Paltz approach as follows:

> The New Paltz program includes a one-semester (changed to one quarter in 1963) general education course on Africa and the Near East which all students must take within their first 2 years at the college * * *. Each member of the program staff alternately addresses a weekly general meeting of approximately 800 students. Sections of 25 or fewer students then meet 2 1-hour periods each week throughout the semester with 1 staff member, during which time the broad topic of the general lecture is explored and discussed on a seminar basis. The student is exposed, therefore, to the views of the specialist, who may or may not be his group leader, and to his own instructor from whom he can continue to learn without interruption.
>
> The Africa-Near East staff numbers four (now eight) people and includes an anthropologist, an economic geographer, a sociologist and a political scientist * * *.
>
> Certain administrative considerations relevant to a multidiscipline program must be pointed up to safeguard the basic goals of the program.
>
> Because topics are introduced in a major lecture to a large audience, attendance of all staff is necessary in order to familiarize them with the specialist's views, to create an atmosphere of unity, and to facilitate further development of the general topic in discussion groups. Frequent meetings of the staff are neces-

sary in order to pull together the major points which are to be raised with the students during discussion periods.

It may well be that the Africa-Near East program, now combined in a one-semester course, could profitably be divided, with each area comprising an offering of one semester. There is no doubt that the combination of Africa south of the Sahara with the Near East and North Africa in a single semester is staggering. To make the most of the time now available, a problem approach is being tried on an experimental basis, allowing comparative analysis of considerations common to the areas. Until September 1961, there had been a rather clear-cut division on the basis of time, with 10 weeks devoted to sub-Saharan Africa and 5 weeks to the Near East and North Africa. The current attempt to consider common problems has been somewhat successful, because, despite variations, general characteristics of the areas have been found to be more similar than dissimilar. The problem approach has also alleviated considerably the pains associated with the transition from one area to the other.

There are other concerns which stem from the multidiscipline approach: (1) financing a staff of such diversified disciplinary backgrounds, (2) availability of personnel, (3) the danger of substituting breadth at the expense of depth, and (4) rivalry among disciplines within the program.

Increasingly, the specialists who are sought are those who combine training in one of the recognized disciplines with their speciality in a given non-Western area. This is true at New Paltz, where faculty members play a double role: teaching non-Western courses in addition to courses within their own discipline. The matter of financing is somewhat less acute in this instance, and the arrangement seems to be very satisfactory for the staff involved.

Recruiting is a major concern. There is little doubt that the discrepancy between available, well-trained specialists and the demand for them is considerable—but it is not irreducible. Even today, when the need is so apparent, contact with the right institutions often brings unexpected surprises. Until recently, non-Western studies have been almost exclusively offered in a few of the leading colleges, and the relatively small number of non-Western scholars have directed their attention to those institutions. Public colleges, with increased Government and State aid, have become keen competitors, however, and often lure top personnel to their campuses with challenging responsibilities in new programs, satisfying salaries, advancement opportunities and relatively secure futures.

The third consideration is the problem of shallowness of offerings under the multidiscipline approach. While this may be generally true, it must be kept in mind that the non-Western courses required at New Paltz, for example, are introductory courses and presume to be nothing more. Advanced electives are open to students who want to pursue their interests further. In the advanced courses the scope is considerably narrowed and deeper inquiry is made possible. The problem of shallowness nevertheless remains a constant concern. It has been suggested that honor sections be introduced to the general education program in which students will be permitted to go as far and as fast as their ability and interest will permit.

Interdiscipline rivalry seems to be common to virtually all universities and all programs. The multidiscipline approach to non-Western studies may sharpen rivalry and bring it into clearer focus when compared to other methods of presentation, but unless the content gets out of hand, both students and faculty can be stimulated by it.[3]

The adoption of the quarter system in 1963 forced the revision of all courses. The introductory courses on Africa and the Near East and on Asian civilization, which Dr. Haffar found "staggering" to handle in a semester, have been further condensed. This has sharpened the need for a problem approach. The revised version of Introduction to Africa and the Near East first offered in 1963 was taught by seven instructors in an 11-week quarter. Dr. Haffer was coordinator of this staff consisting of himself, three Africans and three Americans. There were two main lectures and two discussion meetings in small sections weekly. The course began with 3 weeks on the Near East. The first week dealt with present conditions, and physical and human characteristics; the second with the traditional value system and the impact of the west; the third with the Near East present in relation to the future, as seen in the dynamics of Westernization, and the character of Near Eastern nationalism.

---

[3] *Middle East Studies*, Fall 1962, pp. 13–14.

Africa was studied under comparable headings in 8 weeks. Present conditions were viewed in the light of (*a*) African emergence on the world scene; (*b*) impacts of the United Nations on today's Africa; (*c*) physical characteristics; (*d*) human characteristics. "Africa's Present in the Light of Its Past" reviewed (*a*) traditional value systems; (*b*) pre-European Africa; (*c*) Africa and Europe; (*d*) the impact of the West; (*e*) African renaissance. "Africa's Present in Relation to the Future" was examined from the point of view of (*a*) economic problems; (*b*) political problems; (*c*) social problems; (*d*) contemporary colonialism and racism in Africa; (*e*) new "concepts" and "themes" in Africa; and (*f*) Africa in relation to the non-African world.

Students were required to buy and read the following texts:

Kimble, G. H. T., *Tropical Africa*, vols. I and II (1962).
Hitti, P. K., *Islam and the West* (1962).
Kingsbury, R. C. and Pounds, N. J. G., eds., *An Atlas of Middle Eastern Affairs* (1963).
Antonius, G., *The Arab Awakening* (selections).

They were also assigned readings from 18 other books placed on reserve. Independent study and research papers were optional.

The companion course on Introduction to Asian Civilization followed a similar pattern, with a slightly more topical approach to the cultures of India, China, and Japan and special consideration of the role of communism in Asia and its impact on the rest of the world. Three films were used as integral parts of the course. This course was taught by six instructors, consisting of a Chinese coordinator, an Indian, a Korean, and three Americans with firsthand experience in Asia. One of the staff was a former Korean ambassador to the United Nations and special envoy to newly independent African nations, with a Ph. D. from Princeton and previous teaching experience there and at Chatham, Lehigh, and Yale.

The texts used in the autumn of 1963 were:

Spear, P., *India, Pakistan and the West* (1958).
Goodrich, L. C., *A Short History of the Chinese People* (1959).
Creel, H. G., *Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse Tung* (1960).
Reischauer, E. O., *Japan, Past and Present* (1952).
Storry, R., *A History of Modern Japan* (1960).

In addition to the required general education courses relating to the non-Western world, any candidate for the B.A. may elect to *major in African or Asian Studies* at New Paltz. Either of these majors calls for 52 quarter-credits out of the total of 180 credits needed for graduation. Required courses account for 28 credits, and electives for 24. The standard requirements in general education, 2 years of satisfactory, college-level foreign language competence (which may be established by examination), and additional electives in liberal arts, make up the rest of the program. African studies majors must take seven of the following eight courses, each carrying four credit units:

Cultures of the Middle East
Economic Problems of Africa
Geography of Africa
Religions of the World
History of West Africa *or*
History of East Africa
Systems of Government in Sub-Saharan Africa
Africa in Transition

Asian studies majors take the following seven required courses:

Geography of Asia
Religions of the World
History of Chinese Civilization
Social History of India
History of Japanese Civilization
Government and Politics of East Asia
History of World Social Thought

Neither of these majors requires any African or Asian language. But instruction in Chinese was introduced in 1961 and Russian in 1962. During 1963–64 11 students were taking elementary and 5 intermediate Chinese. The audio-lingual-method of instruction was used, with 4 hours a week in class and at least 1 hour a week in the language laboratory. Each course consisted of three 11-week (one-quarter) sequences, making up a full academic year. Ten students were taking elementary, six intermediate Russian, taught according to a similar pattern, with 5 class hours instead of 4 a week. An advanced course in Russian literature was also offered but was not elected by any students. It is scheduled to meet 4 hours weekly and provides for 1 hour of practice in the language laboratory.

Members of the faculty at New Paltz could teach Arabic, Hindi or some African languages instead of other courses. But thus far there has been almost no demand for such instruction, and the focus has been on acquiring personnel with special competence to teach the required general education courses and more advanced courses dealing with non-Western areas. The administration prefers to consolidate its present non-Western area and language offerings before adding instruction in other critical languages.

The electives relating to the majors in African and Asian studies consist of the following courses, each of which carries four units of credit unless otherwise indicated.

Cultural Anthropology
Art of China and Japan
Art of Africa and Pre-Columbian America
Art of India and Persia
Ancient Art
Basic Economics I and II (8 units)
Money, Banking, and Public Finance I and II (6 units)
Economic Policy I and II (6 units)
History of Economic Thought (8 units)
Asian Literature
Introductory Chinese (12 units)
Intermediate Chinese (8 units)
Economic Geography
Earth and Man
Land and People of Japan
Comparative Government
History of Political Thought
Near East Politics and Institutions
Modern Political Thought
General Sociology
Social Statistics
Modern and Contemporary Social Theory
Methods of Social Research

LIBRARY

The State University College at New Paltz is fortunate in having had an experienced librarian with first-hand knowledge of Asian publications and libraries. Librarian Robert P. Lang spent the year 1960–61 in Pakistan on a Fulbright appointment. Consequently he was able to arrange exchanges of periodicals and gifts of books for the library from Asian institutions which he visited. His experience helped him to acquire the relatively rare special skills necessary to deal efficiently with the complexities of Islamic publications, authors' names and other problems inherent in the integration of oriental materials into a Western college library.

The library contains upward of 100,000 volumes and is growing at the net rate of 5,000 to 6,000 books per year. The current budget for accessions is $37,000, of which $8500 is for the 700 periodicals received annually. Roughly 10 percent of the books and 35 percent of the periodicals (many of the latter being gifts from this country and abroad) relate primarily to the non-Western studies program. The staff rated the library as "good" for student instruction and research on Africa (general), Asia (general), east, south and southeast Asia, but only "adequate" on the Middle East and "poor" on Latin America and Slavic and East European studies. In terms of minimal faculty research for courses, it was rated only "adequate" in the categories evaluated above as good for instruction, and "poor" on the Middle East, Latin America and for Slavic studies. The three most urgent library needs are materials on Latin America, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East.

FOREIGN STUDENTS, VISITORS AND EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

New Paltz welcomed its first foreign students in 1948. Two were from Latin America and two from Europe. Since then a growing number of foreign students from 60 nations have come to the college to add their contributions to its aims to education for world understanding. In 1961–62 there were 35 students from 19 foreign countries. Fifteen came from Africa and others from India, the Philippines, Greece, Mexico, Peru, Argentina, Korea, Taiwan and Indonesia. In 1963–64 there were 30 students from non-Western areas.

Foreign students have been used occasionally as native informants in language courses and are often called on to serve as resource persons in classes. They also speak in debates, at forums or on radio and TV panels. Some are responsible for the staffing of the World Study Center in the library and take pride in this work. The administration believes that the greatest contribution which foreign students make is through their extracurricular activities, in special programs relating to their native lands and simply by living with American students.

In 1963–64, for the first time, two undergraduates were studying in Japan for credit. New Paltz hopes to expand opportunities for American students to study in non-Western areas but finds that most of its students cannot afford the cost in time or money. The Central Institute of Education at the University of Delhi, India, and the college at New Paltz began an affiliation in 1959 looking toward an exchange of publications, of information, and even of advanced students and faculty members. A few students have been exchanged, but mainly at the graduate level.

New Paltz has also trained Peace Corps volunteers for service in Sierra Leone and has welcomed student groups sent under the auspices of the State Department or the experiment in international living from countries such as Algeria, Morocco, and Mexico. General convocations have been addressed by such well-known personalities as Tom Mboya of Kenya and G. L. Mehta, then Indian Ambassador to the United States. A member of the faculty edits the quarterly *Literature East and West*, the newsletter of the Conference on Oriental-Western Literary Relations of the Modern Language Association of America.

CONCLUSION

New Paltz now offers its students exceptional opportunities to learn in depth about various non-Western areas, especially Africa and Asia. It is perhaps unique among U.S. undergraduate colleges in requiring all students to take four courses dealing with the non-Western world as part of their general education program. The college has assembled a faculty remarkable for the number of its members who are specialists on non-Western areas. It is building up the relevant library resources.

One of the difficulties faced by the college administration has been the chronic problem of turnover among specialized faculty members. Another has been the continuing difficulty of deepening the commitment of serving faculty members to non-Western studies. Furthermore, both the pace of library development and the increase of opportunities for faculty members to extend their competence in non-Western studies have been slower that they might have been because the college has had to rely almost exclusively on its own funds.

Nevertheless, New Paltz has made notable progress in its drive to educate all its students in world understanding. It has been a pioneer among public colleges in providing non-Western studies for all students at both introductory and advanced levels and in encouraging other colleges, both in New York State and further afield, to build on its experience. (*Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College.*)

New Graduate Programs in Modern Foreign Languages

by Daymond Turner[*]

Mr. Turner is professor in the department of languages and literature and director of language laboratories at the University of Delaware.

> **Foreign languages (department chairman): Rank, professor; salary compares favorably with the projected 1964–65 AAUP scale. Secretarial assistance. Department includes French, German, Spanish, Latin, Russian, and Hebrew. Number in department currently 7, plus part-time members. Expect to move into graduate program fall, 1965 * * *[1]**

The frequency with which advertisements such as the one cited appear in professional journals shows that the foreign language field has not escaped the pressures for a proliferation of graduate offerings rampant in American higher education today. Can such additions to the graduate curriculum be justified, and, if so, what is implied in terms of objectives, staff, course offerings, and financial support? Should administrators and language teachers acquiesce in their development in the light of a total institutional commitment?

In a survey of the preparation of college teachers of modern foreign languages conducted in 1964, it was found that only 52 departments in 39 universities offer the doctorate in any modern foreign language. And the committee of the Modern Language Association which made the survey assumed that these departments would continue to train the majority of college foreign language teachers for the "foreseeable future."[2]

As a matter of fact, during the academic year 1964–65 at least 324 Ph. D. degrees in modern foreign language were awarded by some 48 institutions. There were 79 in French, 66 in German, and 63 in Spanish, and a smattering in a number of less commonly taught languages. The tabulation also includes 38 degrees in linguistics and 33 in comparative literature, fields which some foreign-language teachers would consider entirely separate disciplines.[3] The total for 1964–65 may appear to be a significant increase over the 237 doctorates in this area granted during the academic year 1962–63, but it should be borne in mind that during the same 3-year period the number of institutions of higher learning grew by 140, and the student population of such

---

[*] © 1966, Ohio State University Press.

[1] *AAUP Bulletin*, LI (June 1965), p. 329.

[2] Archibald T. MacAllister, "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages," *PMLA*, LXIX (May 1964), pp. 1–5.

[3] Statistics based on Robert R. LaDu's "American Doctoral Degrees Granted in the Field of Modern Languages," *Modern Language Journal*, XLIX (December 1965), pp. 492–500. Actually, the number of universities which *offer* a Ph. D. in any modern foreign language is even greater, 81, according to my count of the listings found in Jane Graham, *A Guide to Graduate Study: Programs Leading to the Ph. D.* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965), pp. 592–606

institutions by more than a million.[4] We must also remember that, while college or university teaching is the vocational goal of most doctoral candidates in the humanities, the figures just cited do not represent a net addition to the supply of college teachers, since many of the degree recipients were already engaged in full-time teaching. Ray C. Maul reports that, in the fall of 1964–65, only 17.3 percent of new full-time college foreign-language teachers held a doctorate in their field, while about one-sixth held only a bachelor's degree.[5]

The number of master's degrees awarded in modern foreign language in 1964 was considerably larger than the number of Ph. D.'s. The majority were in French, Spanish, and German, in that order.[6] But, despite the frequent recommendation that a strengthened master's be used to ease teacher shortages on the college level, the indications are that most master of arts candidates still enter secondary school teaching or are already engaged in it full time upon receipt of their degree.

The full extent of the teacher shortage in modern foreign languages is further obscured by the widespread employment of part-time or provisional staff whose only qualification may be the ability to speak the foreign language. Few American colleges or universities would hire a lawyer or an engineer or a taxi driver to teach freshman English. Yet something very analogous is happening in the foreign-language departments of many institutions. In one large urban university of the writer's acquaintance, over 50 percent of a department of 80 members were familiar with, but unprepared to teach, the language to which they were assigned.

The present production of graduate degrees, therefore, appears scarcely adequate for the replacement of faculty who annually leave college teaching by reason of death, illness, retirement, or change of vocation. It will be extremely difficult for existing graduate programs in modern foreign language to keep pace with the demand for additional college teachers created by the establishment of new institutions of higher learning and the growth of enrollment in existing ones.

The case against the terminal master's program has been eloquently set forth by John Lachs.[7] Even when library and laboratory resources are adequate, the difficulty of competing successfully with the more prestigious established programs for faculty and students is an almost insuperable obstacle to the development of courses of high quality at this level. From personal observation of a number of terminal master of arts offerings in my own field, I must conclude that they usually weaken an undergraduate program that is already undermanned and underfinanced without compensatory gain in departmental or institutional prestige. The college or university which cannot afford to undertake a first-quality graduate program in a given discipline had better devote its resources to strengthening undergraduate instruction in that area.

---

[4] See *The World Almanac and Book of Facts*, edited by Harry Hansen (New York: New York World-Telegram & Sun), for data concerning the number of degrees awarded in 1962–63 (1965 ed., p. 540) and in 1963–64 (1966 ed., p. 724), and for the number of institutions and their total enrollments (1965 ed., p. 534, and 1966 ed., p. 732).

[5] "Are College Teachers in Short Supply?" Journal of Higher Education, XXXVI (October 1965), p. 392.

[6] *World Almanac*, 1966 ed., p. 732. Comparable figures for 1965 were not available.

[7] "Graduate Programs in the Undergraduate College," Journal of Higher Education, XXXVI (March 1965), pp. 121–130.

The fledgling doctoral program in a single foreign language will face many of the problems in recruitment and development of facilities which plague the terminal master's program, but, given adequate financial support, it enjoys far better prospects of solving them. This is especially true because of the need for a broad-based graduate curriculum in modern foreign language which will add emphasis on communication skills, cultural understanding, and pedagogical competence to the traditional training in literary and textual criticism and research in historical linguistics.[8]

For several generations the professional ideal was the research scholar modeled after the apocryphal German philologist who devoted his entire career to the investigation of a single Greek noun only to express the deathbed regret that he had not limited his investigation to the dative case, which would have allowed him to produce something that was "truly definitive."

The needs of modern education will no longer tolerate such narrow overspecialization. Nor will they accept, in foreign-language teachers, the "reading only" mastery which led James Russell Lowell, appointed American Minister to Spain after 22 years as Smith professor of languages at Harvard, to complain in a letter to C. E. Norton, "Although having more Spanish than most Spaniards, I couldn't speak, and my French and that got so jumbled up together that I was dumb in the language of diplomacy also * * *."[9]

The primary objective of a doctoral program in any foreign language should be the production of the teacher-scholar who is able to understand, speak, and write, as well as read, both English and his major foreign language with nearly native fluency; who has a broad understanding of linguistic structure, the literature, and the culture which produced them; and who has mastered the techniques of effective transmission of the heritage of his discipline through classroom presentation and through publication.

The doctoral program should be the final link in a continuum of language learning, which might begin as early as the elementary school or as late as the first year of college, and every stage of which would mark measurable progress in control of the language under study in its linguistic and cultural manifestations. The master of arts should represent a definite level of achievement beyond that expected of the bachelor of arts (another criticism of the terminal master's program is its failure to make a clear-cut distinction between what is really expected of graduates as opposed to advanced undergraduates); and the Ph. D., which ought to guarantee the capacity and the desire to continue to learn rather than the end of learning, should represent achievement considerably beyond that of the master of arts.

There will inevitably be a high correlation between the quality of the Ph. D. and the quality of the undergraduate program at the same university. This is true even when 90 to 95 percent of undergraduate enrollment is in the service courses designed to fulfill the degree requirements of the school, the college, or another discipline. Both graduate degrees in foreign language are primarily "teaching" degrees, and a large number of graduate students will serve their teaching apprenticeship at the university from which they will eventually receive a master of arts, a Ph. D., or both degrees. The undergraduate college is not only the prime supplier of raw materials for the graduate school; it is, in this field, a chief consumer of the finished product; and, in the great university, it can serve as a demonstration school for the novice teacher. The major improvement in secondary school foreign-language teaching, growing out of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and its subsequent revisions, points up the need for a parallel advance in college and university foreign-language instruction.

---

[8] Recommendations to this effect are included in the MacAllister report already referred to. Similar recommendations on curriculum were developed independently at almost the same time by a working committee of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. They were reported by Roger L. Hadlich, under the heading "FL's in Colleges and Universities" (pp. 37–57), as part of the *1964 Working Committee Reports* which bear the general title *Foreign Language Teaching: Ideals and Practices.* The volume was edited by George F. Jones and published by the conference in 1964.

[9] Dated Madrid, October 28, 1877. Cited by Stanley T. Williams, *The Spanish Background of American Literature,* vol. II (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955), p. 192.

The new Ph. D. program, as I have intimated, should be more than a blurred carbon copy of some once-prestigious program at another institution. Graduate training in modern foreign language can no longer be limited to discipleship at the feet of a single great master. A respectable program in any of the European or oriental languages which has produced a considerable body of printed literature would require, in a medium-sized university, a full-time staff of at least 10—not well-trained beginners but established professionals. Most of them would teach both undergraduate and graduate courses, although many of the former, particularly those that develop basic language skills, might be given by graduate assistants under the supervision of a senior staff member.

For a language widely taught in American secondary schools, some 25 different undergraduate courses are required to provide the flexibility needed to accommodate varying preparation and the requirements of a major. There should be, perhaps, 10 courses open to both advanced undergraduates and graduates, and another 25 open to graduate students only. (By "course" we mean a class meeting from 3 to 5 hours a week for one semester. Obviously, not all courses need be given every semester or, indeed, every year.)

The instructional effort will require support of nonprofessional staff, such as secretaries, language-laboratory administrative and maintenance personnel, and custodial help. The graduate program requires funds for library development and maintenance research, publication, and travel which do not enter into the usual undergraduate planning. And more efficient instruction is possible if space is allotted in a building specifically designed for foreign-language teaching.

The initial cost of a new program of quality is high in any field. The university which wants to launch a first-class doctoral program in a single modern foreign language must be prepared to pay well above the market price if it hopes to retain the best of incumbent staff and at the same time persuade additional faculty members to leave the prestige institutions for a post in what they may regard as a "minor league," if not "outer Siberia." In addition, scholarship and fellowship funds must be found which will enable the department to compete advantageously for capable graduate students. To build and hold a department of 10, offering the range of courses described, with a minimum undergraduate enrollment of 400 students and a minimum graduate enrollment of 40, would require an annual budget in excess of $340,000.

There is a demonstrable need for additional doctoral programs in modern foreign language. Besides placing the traditional emphasis on knowledge of the literature and the history of a given language, these should demand mastery of the skills (understanding, speaking, reading, and writing), the linguistic structure, the cultural background, and the techniques of their classroom presentation. Such broadened objectives require a larger staff and a wider range of course offerings than have sometimes been considered necessary for an adequate graduate program in a single language. They also call for close articulation of undergraduate offerings and generous financial support. (*Journal of Higher Education*, May 1966.)

Recommendations and Suggestions

*by the Commission on International Understanding, Association of American Colleges**

Under a contract with the U.S. Office of Education, the Commission on International Understanding of the Association of American Colleges carried out a survey of non-Western studies in liberal arts colleges. The report, published in 1964, contained general principles that colleges interested in expanding their non-Western studies should bear in mind in formulating policies and plans appropriate to their own circumstances.

Clemenceau ridiculed Wilson's 14 points by reminding his listeners that "The good Lord had only 10." We are bold enough to list 14 recommendations—13 addressed to liberal arts colleges that are considering non-Western studies, and a 14th directed to the organizations to which the colleges will look for help.

I. The first step toward effective non-Western studies is a firm commitment on the part of the college

We agree with others who have studied the issues involved that the first imperative is *institutional commitment* to a rationally defined academic program,[1] as distinct from naive fascination with the exotic or sentimental yearning for "international understanding." The necessary commitment must be grounded in a consensus of the academic community—students, faculty, administration and trustees—on the aims of liberal education, the goals of the particular college, the range of studies needed to attain these ends. The inclusion of non-Western studies must spring from reasoned conviction of their relevance to agreed ends, not from slavish imitation of prevalent fashions or competitive emulation of rival institutions.

The process by which such conviction may be reached is neither new nor exclusively bound up with non-Western studies. * * * It is simply the process of self-study to which more and more colleges have recently subjected themselves and which every college should undertake from time to time in order to keep its program alive and meaningfully related to the changing environment.

II. The college should formulate a definite plan of action before seeking outside support for non-Western studies

The development of non-Western studies to their present status owes much, as we have noted, to public and private financial support. But outside support did not provide the initiative for this development: it was first attracted by *institutional initiative.* Clearly it is not indispensabel for making a start, as witness some of the colleges that have been studied for this present survey. Hannover, Marian, Mills, and Western College for Women, for example, all embarked on non-Western studies without any special subvention. If we exclude a modest amount of indirect support through the statewide Project for Extending the Study of Foreign Areas in Indiana Undergraduate Education, the first two have had no such subvention to this day.

---

*© 1964, Association of American Colleges.

[1] *The College and World Affairs*, New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964, p. 11; and Howard E. and Florence H. Wilson, *American Higher Education and World Affairs*, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. 1963, pp. 33–34 and 44–45.

Most colleges that intend to introduce a substantial program of non-Western studies will sooner or later need financial assistance, and its availability will govern the rate of development. But, like the colleges themselves, private foundations and governmental agencies have to husband their resources and apply them to projects that offer the best prospect of a satisfactory return on the investment. They cannot afford to spend their money on vague aspirators. Most programs that have received support had *already started* and were engaging the attention of at least a few members of the faculty and a sizable number of students before aid was forthcoming. In any case, for non-Western studies as for other fields of educational experiment, potential benefactors will expect to be presented with a well-thought-out, practical plan for reaching a defined and attainable goal—together with concrete evidence of the college's intention to commit a suitable proportion of its own resources.

III. Planning must begin with a realistic inventory and assessment of institutional resources

The formulation of a workable plan of action requires a thoroughgoing *inventory of the college's available resources*, both human and material, and a realistic assessment of their potentialities for a non-Western program. Without such an assessment of practical possibilities, planning is little better than dreaming. The smaller the faculty, the more limited the facilities and the lower the income of the college, the more crucial the inventory. Its importance is emphasized by all of the smaller colleges we have studied. Marian and Mills are significant examples. One of the most valuable benefits of an inventory is that it may reveal unsuspected resources, notably faculty knowledge and experience which have hitherto gone unnoticed, or at any rate unused, for lack of appropriate outlets. These assets may make a critical difference to the possibility of undertaking non-Western studies.

Taking an inventory and drafting an effective program is a task for an *interdepartmental committee of the faculty*, in collaboration with the administration. Depending on circumstances, the committee may be a standing committee on the curriculum (as at New Paltz), a committee charged with a comprehensive institutional self-study (as at Hanover), and *ad hoc* committee on non-Western studies or the equivalent (as at Dartmouth, Marian, and Portland State) or a special subcommittee of the curriculum committee (as at Mills). What is essential is that the committee, regardless of its formal status, be representative of all the principal departments of the college likely to be involved in any non-Western program. An interdepartmental committee, moreover, reflects the interdisciplinary character of non-Western studies.

IV. The fullest possible degree of faculty support must be enlisted to insure a sound and enduring program

Most programs for strengthening the non-Western component in an institutional curriculum have their genesis in the thinking of one man or of a small group of individuals from the faculty, the administration or both. The awareness and conviction requisite to the initiation of non-Western studies may stem from longstanding personal knowledge of a non-Western area or from more recent interest gained in private or government assignments overseas. Seldom will such experience be possessed by more than a minority of the faculty.

The crucial initiative has sometimes—in such cases as Mills, New Paltz, and California State College at Hayward—come from the president of a college. In other instances—such as Earlham and Portland State—faculty members have spurred their colleges to significant non-Western efforts.

But regardless of source, it is the idea that counts and needs to be nurtured. It must be protected both against the overenthusiasm sometimes aroused by proposals for curricular reform and against destructive sniping by unpersuaded members of the faculty. This makes it *imperative to involve the faculty in all stages of planning* from the inventory onward, so that they will have every opportunity to resolve their doubts and become firmly convinced.

When a new college is to be established, either independently or within a university framework (as at the University of the Pacific), the responsible administrators may find it expedient, or indeed unavoidable, to do their own planning with minimal faculty participation. In all other cases it would be well to heed the advice of experienced administrators that it is unwise "to try to impose * * * ideas on the faculty or to hurry the process of change."[3] Only a convinced faculty will in the long run guarantee the development and continuance of a worthy program.

V. New faculty appointments should be made with a view to strengthening non-Western competence as well as filling departmental vacancies

Few colleges that come fresh to the undertaking will be able to get very far without the addition of at least one or two new faculty members. What particular additions are needed will largely depend on the content of the program adopted, and unless the college is exceptionally well-heeled, some desirable appointments will have to await the availability of financial assistance.

If we are right about the essential role of languages, some *language teachers* will be needed. Teachers of non-Western languages are scarce. American students seldom want to become language teachers and they have continually resisted preparing for this occupation: they prefer to become linguists or men of letters. You can lead a man to a language program but you can't make him teach. The language fellowship awards under NDEA, for example, have produced far more area specialists than language teachers. This state of affairs will continue to hamper the development of undergraduate programs, but it is by no means hopeless. Some language teachers are available and more will appear, and some area specialists will be able to contribute to language teachings.

---

[3] Thomas E. Jones, Edward V. Stanford and Goodrich C. White, *Letters to College Presidents*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964, ch. 12 ("Preparing the Ground for a New Curriculum"), p. 74.

The main demand, however, will be for *area specialists*—not in the old sense of persons whose specialty consisted entirely in a general knowledge of the principal features of a cultural region, but in the sense of persons who combine a broad, general knowledge of the area with a high level of scholarly competence in their own disciplines and, normally, have considerable field experience in the area and competence in its languages.[3]

The graduate programs of universities, and especially the language and area centers supported by the National Defense Education Act, have begun to provide a flow of suitably qualified men and women. Many of them, as we have already suggested, will be ready to respond to the challenge of developing non-Western studies at a liberal arts college, in spite of the probable dearth on a small campus of colleagues and books in their special fields. Sometimes they will be able to help in teaching one of the appropriate languages. In any case, they are trained to fill a dual role—teaching courses within the particular sphere of their own departmental discipline and non-Western courses of a more general character

VI. Every opportunity should be utilized to fortify and extend the non-Western competence of present faculty members

At most colleges, the opening phases of a non-Western program must be built around the faculty resources already present. For this purpose the institutional inventory is obviously of capital importance. The paramount need of most faculties will be to enlarge their scholarly competence in non-Western fields. Their members must be given every opportunity and encouragement to satisfy this need. Private study on campus, attendance at summer courses, full-year study at graduate schools, participation in the activities of scholarly organizations, study and teaching abroad, either on sabbatical leave or on special leave for service under educational exchange programs, should all be utilized, as appropriate, for this purpose.

Whether through released time or through direct financial support, *faculty members must be assisted to broaden their academic foundations.* A realistic budget for a sound and enduring program must make adequate provision for these purposes. Limited help is available from the U.S. Office of Education, with its special postdoctoral awards under title VI of NDEA, from the Fulbright-Hays program, and from some of the major foundations, but further help is needed.

VII. The interdisciplinary faculty seminar is a valuable means of maintaining interest in a program while enlarging faculty capabilities

The experience of a sizable fraction of the colleges whose programs we report on in detail (for example, Marian, Mills, Western College for Women, the colleges of the Atlanta University System, the Gettysburg group and the Winston-Salem group) suggests that the most valuable single device for creating and holding faculty interest, increasing scholarly competence and maintaining a sense of common purpose is the *interdisciplinary faculty seminar.* Designed to increase faculty members' acquaintance with the historical, social and cultural background of a particular non-Western area, it may also encourage them in further study and research. In addition, the seminar provides opportunities for informal interdisciplinary discussion of the content and procedures of the college's non-Western program.

---

[3] Cf. Donald N. Bigelow, "The Center Concept and the Changing Curriculum," *Higher Education*, July 1962.

In most but not all of the colleges studied, the seminars made use of outside specialists as directors or participants. Weekly or monthly meetings were held, usually throughout the academic year. Released time for preparatory study was sometimes but not always allowed. Attendance was voluntary, but broad and active participation was encouraged, especially from the departments most directly concerned with the non-Western program. In fact, at most of the colleges that organized seminars an impressively high proportion of the whole faculty took part in at least one such series of meetings.

For many liberal arts colleges the interdisciplinary seminar will remain an important means of developing and sustaining an effective non-Western program, but it can become superficial and at best is essentially a spur to individual effort. Evidence exists that seminars did not always strike a spark, that released time was sometimes all but wasted. Yet ideally the device may provide a concrete realization of the power of non-Western studies to break through departmental barriers and help to unify and strengthen the liberal arts curriculum.

VIII. College resources should be supplemented by visiting scholars from abroad and from other U.S. institutions and by judicious use of foreign students

Scholars brought to the campus as visiting professors or occasional lecturers on non-Western subjects may be citizens of one of the countries studied in the college program. Such persons can often convey a feeling for their ancestral culture rarely matched by an American scholar, no matter how profound his intellectual grasp of the culture. Suitably qualified men and women (including some Americans of non-Western descent) are more readily available than most colleges realize. * * *

Clearly a foreign scholar will make the greatest impact on a college if he comes to it for a semester or longer, under such arrangements as the Fullbright-Hays program, rather than for a brief visit. If, as at New Paltz, Portland State and Winston-Salem, for instance, well-qualified scholars who are natives of the region which the college has chosen to focus on can be found for regular appointment to the faculty, so much the better. But even brief visits from sensitive indigenous interpreters of non-Western societies help to sustain the interest of faculty and students.

No less valuable assistance has come from U.S. scholars who specialize in non-Western areas. Their contributions may range from brief visits, during which they provide advice and occasional lectures or take part in a faculty seminar, to a semester or an academic year of formal teaching. Teachers who have participated in university language and area programs and have taught undergraduates can be especially helpful. Also, it is frequently possible to invite, for shorter or longer periods, professors who have recently spent time in the target area, whether for research or on a Government assignment.

The benefit of having on campus living and breathing exemplars of a non-Western society is a strong argument for admitting a reasonable number of foreign students. Not every college will find it expedient to have as high a proportion of foreign students as Western College for Women (some 10 percent of the whole student body in 1963–64), but any college with a non-Western program stands to gain from the presence of at least a few students from the relevant area. They too can be valuable interpreters of their culture, through classroom discussions, organized extracurricular activities and the casual contacts of daily life. But foreign students should be neither exploited nor enthroned. Just as the chief business of the college is to educate Americans, so it must be borne in mind that foreign students come to the United States in pursuit of their own educational aims rather than to serve any local interest.

IX. Non-Western programs must include the development of adequate library holdings and staff

After faculty, if not before, the most essential resource of a college is teaching material. For the humanities and the social sciences, which embrace all courses normally embodied in a non-Western program, this means, above all, books and periodicals. Our inquiry shows that *library facilities* reveal as serious deficiencies as do faculties for the purposes of non-Western studies. With few exceptions, even among the colleges that have already made a start on a non-Western program, libraries are woefully inadequate for student reading, let alone further study on the part of the faculty. The cost of filling the gaps will be high and a generous allowance for books and periodicals will have to be made in the budget. At the same time, economy dictates careful discrimination in the choice of items. This may well be beyond the capacity of the average college librarian with no special training in non-Western fields. Outside advice will almost always be needed. In addition, either through retraining or recruitment, the library staff itself will have to undergo the same process of development as is needed by the faculty, if it is to play its proper role in serving the non-Western program.

X. Provision ought to be made for the teaching of relevant languages

Opinions differ on the place of indigenous languages in non-Western studies, but we believe that the teaching of at least one major regional language is all but indispensable to an effective program. The Committee on the College and World Affairs cites the argument that "for the undergraduate a good translation may be a better vehicle for understanding than a poor knowledge of the language." This is quite true insofar as understanding derives from the acquisition of information. As a matter of speed and convenience, the student will usually study a good part of his non-Western material in translation—if good translations exist. But for grasping the thought patterns of an alien society nothing takes the place of a working knowledge of its language. Certainly no foreign scholar would be accepted as a serious student of American culture if he did not know a word of English.

Most of the colleges we have studied have developed substantial non-Western programs that do not include language instruction (except in Spanish, which is almost universal, and Russian, which is fairly widespread). Mills, for example, reports that it "acts on the assumption that high-quality substantive instruction relating to non-Western cultures can be offered without teaching non-Western languages at the undergraduate level." * * * Yet the same report states that the college "is willing to grant credit to students who learn such languages elsewhere" and that members of the faculty and the administration are "open to the possibility of introducing certain major non-Western languages into the curriculum at a later stage if funds and personnel to do so can be found."

The inference is inescapable that the omission of non-Western languages derives less from conviction that they are not necessary than from concern over the practical difficulties involved in introducing them. The difficulties are real enough but they are by no means insuperable. Good teaching is necessary and well-qualified teachers are scarce, but thanks to the graduate language and area programs the supply is gradually increasing. Moreover, language learning in general has been made easier and more effective by new teaching methods and mechanical aids which have been developed in the last few years and which continue to be refined.

XI. Cooperative arrangements of all sorts should be used to assist in the development of adequate programs and especially to ease the burden of language teaching

In non-Western studies as in many other fields, much that is beyond the reach of an individual college can be achieved through interinstitutional cooperation. In the broadest sense of the term, cooperation ranges from nationwide programs open to any college student, through collaboration among colleges that are members of a regional organization, to a variety of joint enterprises involving two or more neighboring colleges. For any given college it is important to be aware of the full range of possibilities and to utilize those that are pertinent to the college's own plans.

An outstanding example of programs serving the whole country is the cooperative undergraduate program for critical languages organized by Princeton University to enable students from other colleges to study uncommon languages for a full academic year, in tandem with summer study in one of the NDEA intensive language programs. It may be expected that the example of Princeton will be followed by universities in other parts of the country that are able to offer instruction in uncommon languages to undergraduates.

Regional collaboration is typified by the Indiana project, enabling the State university to help private colleges in the State solve particular problems involved in the introduction of non-Western studies, and by the Great Lakes Colleges Association, which helps any of its 12 member colleges that are interested in developing non-Western studies by organizing joint arrangements for faculty development and for overseas study and research. Recent endeavors by the New York State Department of Education to foster non-Western studies in both public and private colleges in the State are among the most comprehensive of regional experiments thus far undertaken.

Cooperative arrangements among neighboring colleges (not only for the purposes of non Western study) are a growing phenomenon on the academic scene. In the field of our present concern, participation in such arrangements was reported by over 100 of the colleges responding to our survey. * * * Cooperation may entail a variety of aims, curricular and extracurricular, but essentially it is a *pooling of resources to enable each of the partners to enlarge the scope of its non-Western* *activities more economically and sometimes more effectively than it could do alone.* Cooperation may enable the participating colleges to avoid duplication of library facilities, of specialized courses (notably in uncommon languages) and consequently of scarce teaching skills. It provides students with a wider range of opportunities and faculty members with increased mobility, which may enable them to teach a higher proportion of courses in their own specialties and sometimes even to find time for private study.

Yet cooperative arrangements are no panacea. Some have worked well, others have not. As in any partnership, much depends on the congeniality of the partners. Any divergence of basic aims may well prove fatal. If one college wants to establish a full-scale program on a particular area, replete with language offerings and library holdings, and another prefers to move around from one cultural area to another in successive years, cooperation between them will be difficult. At best, one school would be disappointed: at worst, the whole edifice might collapse, with the investment wasted and the impulse to innovation dissipated.

The simplest form of cooperation consists in the exchange of information and experience, either between an undergraduate college and a university that is better versed in the problems of non-Western study or between colleges that are grappling with similar problems. Among the colleges we have studied, the Atlanta University group and Florida Presbyterian College have taken pains to investigate the experience of comparable institutions, but as a general rule there has been too little mutual consultation. One of the purposes of this report is to help correct this omission, but it cannot take the place of direct communication.

Perhaps the most concrete benefit of cooperative action now visible occurs in the teaching of uncommon languages. All of the various types of cooperative arrangements provide means of sharing the cost, in manpower and money, of language instruction. Above all, the existence of summer programs for intensive language study at many of the major universities should encourage undergraduate colleges to undertake the teaching of non-Western languages, in the knowledge that even modest efforts on the home campus can be augmented and reinforced.

XII. A variety of means may be employed to incorporate non-Western studies into the liberal arts curriculum, but for optimum understanding an integrated program is the most promising

Any non-Western component embodied in the curriculum must be both internally coherent and integrated with the rest of the institutional program. Most colleges may have to be content with a modest start, but in any case the undertaking must be capable of organic growth within the framework of the college's present and prospective resources. Piecemeal introduction of individual courses on non-Western subjects has historically served a useful purpose in awakening interest in the larger possibilities of non-Western study, but this *ad hoc* procedure has been outdated by the march of events. It would be a waste of time and effort and would tend to obstruct rather than foster the development of satisfactory programs if all colleges undertaking non-Western studies had to grope their way through the same series of mistakes. A higher degree of sophistication is now possible, especially in the earlier stages of launching a program. Not only must non-Western courses be illuminating in themselves but they must make a recognizable contribution to the overall aims of the institution.

Appropriate courses may take several forms: the interdisciplinary introduction to a non-Western civilization, the regular departmental course infused with non-Western subject matter wherever it is pertinent, and the course—in any of several disciplines—devoted entirely to a non-Western subject. Any of these types may be used as they fit in with institutional aims and available competence, and there is no reason to avoid mixing them in any reasonable relation to each other. *The essential principle is that they should in total constitute a coordinated program*, rooted in the individual disciplines but integrating their contributions by organizing them around a non-Western culture or society.

Such a non-Western program would offer the possibility of concentration with a major or minor. If an introductory survey course were included, this might be required and therefore reach all students, in contrast to the smaller number that might be expected to elect the entire program or any of its parts. To be sure, the survey course does not achieve adequate depth, the integrated program fails to reach all students, and therefore even a combination of the two does not afford an ideal solution. Yet a combined approach remains, at this point in time, the most promising means of providing for all students the opportunity of achieving a general understanding of the non-Western contribution to the human venture and for some the option of beginning more specialized study of a particular culture.

XIII. *In order to provide for systematic modification and adjustment, machinery should be established for continuous review and appraisal*

Programs of the kind we have suggested represent for most colleges an ideal that will take several years to realize. Our recommendations are intended as guidelines for the administration and faculty in working out, in consonance with their own vision of liberal education and their prospective resources, a program that can be put into effect through a gradual process of planned development. However good the initial planning, progressive experience will reveal a need for changes and adjustments. No curriculum is final, perfect and unalterable. Non-Western studies in particular are a long way from that condition. So it behooves every college that undertakes a non-Western program to charge the curriculum committee, or some other appropriate body, with express responsibility for *coordinating the development of the program, evaluating its performance and verifying its assumptions.*

XIV. Governmental agencies and private foundations need to step up their assistance to non-Western studies at the college level now and in the years just ahead

Our final recommendation is addressed to the various agencies representing American society which have seen non-Western studies as vital to higher education. As the Committee on the College and World Affairs pointed out, non-Western studies offer the major benefactors of higher education a great opportunity to serve both a national need and the cause of liberal education. What the philanthropic foundations and the Federal Government have already done in this field encourages us to believe that they will continue their invaluable contribution to the rate of progress and the quality of programs. But their assistance has been overwhelmingly concentrated at the graduate level (where it was natural and proper for it to start) and has barely began to touch undergraduate education.

At this stage, the encouragement of non-Western studies in undergraduate colleges will not only serve to sustain and enliven the liberal arts but will also furnish help where it is likely to yield the highest returns. The quality of graduate education depends upon the quality of the undergraduate experience. This is the business of the liberal arts college.

Our report has shown that the majority of colleges are at least aware of the challenge presented by non-Western study. A sizable minority have already responded to this challenge. Others seem anxious to do so. But, if progress is to continue, help is needed—for students, for faculty and for libraries—and it is needed *now* when the critical step has been taken and the will to go forward is strong. (*Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College*)

What Should Be the Role of Area Programs in the 60's?

by Ward Morehouse[*]

Mr. Morehouse contributed one of the guideline papers to the 1960 15th Annual National Conference on Higher Education of the Association for Higher Education. Formerly educational director of the Asia Society, Mr. Morehouse is director, Office of Foreign Area Studies, State Education Department, University of the State of New York.

The two questions I will touch on briefly are first, area study programs as instruments of advanced training and research on foreign areas; and secondly, the problem of the study of traditions patterned differently from our own as a dimension of liberal education.

I would like to start by setting before you what I might call Morehouse's hypothesis, not because of any desire for proprietorship, but because it is sufficiently dogmatic that I would not want it inadvertently ascribed to anyone else. This hypothesis is that academic programs on particular foreign areas, as identifiable educational enterprises, flourish in inverse relationship to our knowledge of those areas and in corresponding proportion to our awareness of this lack of knowledge.

With respect to the first question I indicated above, that of advanced training and research in foreign areas, I think one can say that the original proponents of area studies were the classicists and as long as we have had classical studies in our colleges and universities we have had area programs, although they were not always identified as such. The real impetus came during the Second World War and the immediate postwar period. These developments gave birth to what we commonly identify as area study programs today.

One area where there has been very striking growth in the past few years illustrates the hypothesis that I have just set forth. This is the field of African studies. One can readily see that rather prodigious growth in relative terms of academic programs dealing with Africa is certainly a reflection of our ignorance about this part of the world; and the fact that these programs have developed rather recently is also, I think, a reflection of our awareness of just how ignorant we in fact were of a part of the world that has become increasingly important.

To my knowledge there was virtually no work on this area at any American university, outside of Northwestern and perhaps some beginnings at Boston University, only a few years ago. Now we have four or five more programs of substance that have developed in places such as Howard University, UCLA, and Yale. All of this, I would submit, is a reflection of our ignorance, our profound national igno-

---

[*]© 1960 National Education Association of the United States.

rance, of an increasingly important part of the world and our sudden awareness of this ignorance.

Now, what will be the implications of these professionally oriented study programs, if I may describe them that way, for the future? I hope it will not be inferred that the hypothesis which I set forth was any comment on the utility of area programs in certain contexts. Within the context of advanced training and research, the area study program as an academic instrumentality is an enormously useful device, although I think it perhaps seems more useful than it sometimes is because of our low level of sophistication about some of these foreign areas. We find it more difficult to conceive of studying about Western Europe, with which we are so much more familiar, within the context of this type of academic organization.

I would suggest that the reason we do tend to approach the world beyond Europe within the context of area study programs is because of our relative ignorance about it. I wonder not only whether we are not going to see some very fruitful advances in terms of research on specific foreign areas, but whether, hopefully, we are not going to achieve the point where we are going to have enough scholars who know enough about particular foreign areas to begin to make some valid, explicit comparisons between different areas.

The other major role which the area study programs will play in the coming years is in the training of nonacademic specialists on foreign areas. Perhaps this is a good point to introduce my own definition of area specialist, or for that matter of any sort of specialist; namely, that there is no such individual, there are only varying degrees of ignorance about these matters. Nonetheless, we have what we commonly describe as an area specialist, and I think the area study program is going to be a very useful device for training such people who presumably will go into some sort of professional activity with an international dimension to it.

The area study programs are, in my judgment, going to be less useful in the years ahead in training for academic careers. As long as the traditional disciplines in the social sciences and humanities provide the guidelines for the ways in which we organize our colleges and universities academically, the effort to produce "area" Ph. D.s particularly, is simply going to come to naught because these people are not marketable academically. I think what little experience there has been with this type of endeavor at the doctoral level substantiates my assertion. I do not regard as belonging in this context the traditional degree in the language and literature of a particular foreign culture. This clearly has a valid place in the scheme of things in our colleges and universities, and we will continue to produce persons with training of this sort.

The second question is the matter of study of traditions other than our own as a dimension of liberal education. First of all, it seems to me that the primary purpose of liberal education in this country is to illuminate, insofar as possible, our own largely Western tradition for our students. But an equally valid objective of liberal education is the systematic development of some points of reference outside of that tradition. I would, thirdly, submit that the overwhelming majority of Americans graduate from college without any such points of reference. I would finally maintain that this is an illiberal education.

It is pretty clear that, again, within the past few years, there has been an enormous increase of concern with this problem. It has some formidable implications for anybody who is concerned with concrete steps in a particular institution. In my view, it is fair to call this concern one of the forward edges in the development of liberal education today in this country.

It is, I think, entirely proper to say that the existing curricula for colleges and universities in the social sciences and humanities are in a sense one large area study of the Western tradition and its contemporary configurations. This has had all sorts of implications including such elementary matters as labeling of courses. One of my missions in life is to promote honestly in course labeling, and I would insist that a course in world literature, which in fact deals with Western literature, be so titled. It is a perfectly valid proposition to study Western literature, but let us call it that and not suggest with implicit arrogance that all that is significant by way of literary expression is Western.

One can produce endless examples of this sort. But I think one has to go beyond that and say that in terms of the development of at least certain of our academic disciplines we have committed an intellectual error of rather major proportions. What we have been doing is advancing as universal propositions those that are based in fact only on Western experience. No doubt, there are some economists who will take issue with me, but it always seems to me that the economists, and also the philosophers, are perhaps among the most parochial of those in any of the disciplines in the social sciences and humanities. There is only beginning to develop, in my meager knowledge of the field, a concern, a recognition that some of the economic propositions which have been advanced as universally applicable are in fact only applicable to Western economic institutions because this is all the economists have studied.

In terms of trying to look at the future implications of this, there are basically two approaches to the liberal arts curriculum with an infinite number of gradations in between. The first approach is to universalize the disciplines. This suggests, in terms of the undergraduate curriculum, drawing much more significant material from the world beyond Europe into introductory disciplinary courses. I think it is a reasonable assertion to state that this is rarely done, save in a few disciplines that have been traditionally concerned with the world beyond Europe and of which I suppose anthropology is the most obvious.

The second approach that has developed somewhat, and I would perceive more development of, is the systematic and necessarily interdisciplinary study of identifiable foreign areas and traditions. I submit that such study is necessary because of our low level of sophistication about many of these areas. In other words, it is almost impossible, it seems to me, for the average American undergraduate to have any real conception of the political process and political institutions in contemporary Indian society without knowing something of the religious fabric of that society, its social institutions, its historical development. It is fairly obvious also that the average undergraduate does not come equipped with this sort of background because he is a product of a formal educational process which is myopic in its view of the rest of the world.

I am, all other things being equal, opposed to the establishment of "area study programs" for purposes of adding this new dimension to liberal education. I am opposed to them partly on tactical grounds, but I am also opposed to them for another reason. I think the great tendency for the establishment of area study programs, quite apart from the sort of suspicion that it arouses elsewhere in any faculty about academic empire building, is to put this type of educational enterprise somewhere on the periphery of the main stream of academic life of the college community. It seems to me that above all else our task in the coming decade is going to be to enlarge the intellectual and cultural horizons of all college students and we are not going to do this if we simply insert a course here or there in an obscure corner of the curriculum which attracts a few students. This has been in fact very widely done. This type of formal course work is simply not a part of the main stream of intellectual life of the overwhelming majority, if not all, of our colleges and university communities, and until we can assert that every American who calls himself liberally educated does, in fact, have some meaningful points of reference outside of his own tradition, we should not presume that we are providing a truly liberal education for our college students. (*1960 Current Issues in Higher Education*, Proceedings of the 15th Annual National Conference on Higher Education, Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., March 6–9, 1960.)

O

Undergraduate Instruction in Critical Languages and Area Studies

by the Conference on Undergraduate Instruction in Critical Languages and Area Studies

The following recommendations for a course of action for concerned institutions were made by 68 scholars, specialists in critical languages and area studies, who were brought together at Princeton University on October 12–13, 1964. The conference, chaired by Cyril E. Black, chairman of the Committee on Regional Studies at Princeton, was jointly sponsored by the university and the Office of Education.

In the past two decades American education has been confronted with a number of striking challenges evoked by the explosion of knowledge in all fields, but especially in the natural sciences and by the nature of a rapidly changing world in which the United States has been called upon to play a leading role. The first and essential step in meeting the latter challenge has been the successful development of graduate programs which have educated more than 3,000 specialists both in a discipline and in knowledge of the language and area of their interest.

Now that this core of skilled personnel has been prepared for careers in academic life, the government, business, and international affairs, the time has come to assess what American education must do to meet its responsibilities to a nation that continues to carry important obligations in the world. It is clear that graduate training of language and area specialists must be maintained and that able young students must still be attracted to and prepared in these fields. It is equally clear, however, that both to sustain and improve the quality of training and personnel in language and area studies and to assist the revolution in the spirit and outlook of undergraduate education that is needed if we are to remain true to the purposes of liberal education for a world community, study of the major critical languages (Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Hindi-Urdu, Portuguese, and Russian) and related area studies must now be extended to a wider segment of undergraduate institutions, the majority of which have been only indirectly affected by the great upsurge of such study in the graduate schools.

In this process every effort must be made to insure that our scarce national resources in skilled teachers and in library and supplementary materials are allocated and used efficiently, and that high standards of language and area instruction are maintained. This will undoubtedly require far greater concentration than in the past on the training of competent language teachers and of area specialists determined to teach in undergraduate institutions.

Two main lines of development are clearly indicated: expansion of undergraduate instruction at institutions which are now engaged in teaching the critical languages, and the gradual establishment of new programs for undergraduate instruction at other institutions as resources become available. To this end, the following priorities are recommended:

1. Attention should be devoted during the next 5 years to strengthening institutions which demonstrate a capability to provide sustained undergraduate instruction in critical languages leading to competence in speaking and reading the language being studied.

2. As soon as possible new programs for undergraduate instruction in critical languages and area studies should be established, provided institutions wishing to offer such instruction are able to appoint qualified faculty and to furnish adequate library and laboratory facilities to support sustained instruction leading to competence in speaking and reading.

3. To permit the expansion recommended in the preceding two paragraphs, a rapid increase in the number of teachers of critical languages is needed. Teachers for both undergraduate and secondary school programs are needed, though for the moment the demand for the former may be somewhat greater. A number of urgent measures will have to be taken to overcome the crippling shortage of competent language teachers: conscious direction of fellowship support to students and teachers who are either interested in or show potential for language teaching; special efforts by at least some graduate language and area centers to train language teachers; provision of specil institutes or in-service training programs to improve the teaching competence of persons now teaching the critical languages; exploration of the possibility of providing special programs to train as teachers native speakers now in the United States or who might be brought from abroad; clear recognition by specialists in the field, faculty colleagues, chairmen of departments, and administrators that language teachers perform an important, in fact essential, function in academic programs in the critical languages and related area studies and that those with merit should be recompensed and promoted accordingly.

4. In the next few years, during which the scarcity of resources will limit the opportunities open to undergraduates to study the critical languages and until new programs can be developed, encouragement should be given to activities that serve the needs of many institutions and that help, in a transitional period, to utilize resources in an optimum fashion: coöperative undergraduate programs during the regular academic year, intensive summer programs, and programs for overseas study.

5. Scholarships should be made available to students throughout the country, on the basis of quality and program, to assist them in the study of the critical languages either through cooperative arrangements discussed in the preceding paragraph or through special programs arranged at the student's own institution or outside it.

6. Further effort should be made to stimulate and support research and experimentation in the theory and practice of language teaching, as well as the development of additional materials and of standard testing of levels of proficiency in the critical languages.

7. Institutions which demonstrate a capability to provide instruction in critical languages and related area studies should be assisted to develop the library holdings, both in language and reference materials and in works in English on the language and area, necessary to support their instructional programs.

8. Since the creation of a broad educational environment by instruction in related area studies is intimately connected with the teaching of critical languages, institutions should be encouraged to expand their teaching resources in this direction. This requires fellowship support to students who wish to combine discipline and area training, the retraining of existing college faculty, support of teaching internships at area centers, and research support to area specialists devoted to a career teaching in undergraduate colleges and universities. (*Undergraduate Instruction in Critical Languages and Area Studies.*)

Summary and Recommendations
*by the Princeton University Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in the United States**

The Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies: A Guide for High School and College Programs was convened by Princeton University with a grant from the Office of Education on December 17–18, 1965, to consider the best ways to impart to high school and college students a knowledge of foreign areas and cultures appropriate for our times. The participants made recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of successful programs and urged the inauguration of new programs and approaches, as follows:

I. Foreign language and area studies have an important part to play in the education of American students. Although substantial progress has been made, especially since World War II, only a small part of the educational potential of such studies has been realized in the colleges and high schools.

Recommendations: (1) At all levels, the emphasis should be on developing quality programs, if necessary of limited scope, rather than on coverage for its own sake. (2) Support should be given, through the cooperation of the Federal and State Governments, private foundations, universities, private and public schools, and professional language and area associations, to the systematic development of study and teaching aids and to their wide dissemination to colleges and secondary schools. Bibliographies, library acquisition guides, model curricular programs, textbooks, and other study materials currently available should be evaluated, supplemented, and expanded.

II. Some colleges and universities may lag behind in developing language and area studies. In a few cases, this may stem from the institution's failure to perceive the educational importance of such programs, but even where their value is recognized, shortages of qualified staff and of library resources pose formidable barriers.

Recommendations: (1) All institutions should be encouraged to develop representative offerings in at least one area-language combination. (2) In the interim, however, it would be advantageous to create a nationwide network of cooperative programs, each serving several colleges, and to expand programs under which undergraduates can transfer for 1 or 2 years to institutions where advanced courses are available. Intensive summer study opportunities for undergraduates should also be further developed. (3) The mode of introduction of area courses will vary with the educational aims and resources of the particular institution. Some may be able to introduce specialized courses on certain areas, others may infuse existing courses with units on foreign areas, and still others may find it useful to adopt both approaches. In all cases, the colleges should regularly examine

---

*© 1966 American Council on Education.

their curriculums to determine whether they are doing justice to cultures other than our own and its antecedents. (4) The development of new curriculums and the anticipated increase in qualified teachers should be accompanied by the provision of adequate teaching aids and the ample stocking of libraries at all levels.

III. Historically, language and area studies have first been developed at the professional graduate centers. This development should be extended and strengthened. Language and area studies, however, should not be limited to the "elite" segments of the student population: such studies have important implications for all students in promoting self-awareness and citizenship and are adaptable to a wide variety of educational purposes.

Recommendations: (1) Although the graduate centers necessarily and appropriately will continue to occupy the central place in providing expertise, guidance, and resources, the special requirements of college and secondary school curricula (especially where language and area studies are to be part of general education) dictate the early and full involvement of college and secondary school teachers in future developmental efforts. They should be not merely consulted; they should be encouraged to play an originating role as well. (2) A conference bringing together university specialists and college and secondary school teachers and administrators should be convened so that university specialists may become more familiar with the special needs of teaching programs at and below the college level.

IV. Early training in appropriate languages, beginning in elementary school, appears to be feasible and should be encouraged as resources allow.

Recommendations: Such early training should be undertaken as part of a continuing sequence of language learning; exposure that is not consistently re-enforced and built upon is probably wasted. The general educational value of early language training should be recognized: early competence in a foreign language arouses interest in a foreign culture for its own sake and in human terms.

V. The educational values of language and area studies are best realized at all levels when these studies are incorporated into a more general comparative and interdisciplinary approach to the comprehension of societies and cultures in their international setting. Accordingly, no single disciplinary approach is adequate.

Recommendations: (1) The humanities and the social sciences are mutually supporting approaches to language and area studies; these approaches should be explored and encouraged. (2) The methods of introducing language and area studies in colleges and secondary schools (and even in elementary schools) should take into account their usefulness as broadening and humanizing experiences for the student. (3) The recent curricular reforms in high school mathematics and science should stimulate a thorough examination of methods in language and area instruction to determine what improvements might be appropriate.

VI. Voluntary experimental programs show that precollege students are receptive to and capable of learning the "difficult" languages. Among the most successful models are area centers that provide extracurricular opportunities for local high school students to attend college-level classes.

Recommendations: Existing and successful programs, including those now privately or voluntarily arranged by university area and language centers, should be given immediate assistance, so that they may maintain current work and, if desirable, expand. They are important not only for their current contributions, but also as models for other programs. Their experience suggests that one of the most effective interim ways of extending language and area instruction to the secondary schools is for such university centers to service several schools in the surrounding areas on a cocurricular or extracurricular basis. Such arrangements, particularly when they involve private universities, require outside financial support. They should also make it possible for exceptionally qualified and talented secondary school students to enroll directly in college language courses.

VII. There is a shortage of qualified teachers of area studies and languages in the colleges and secondary schools. Support by the Federal Government and foundations has improved the situation in the colleges, but the secondary schools have not yet been given adequate attention.

Recommendations: (1) All available resources should be used to encourage an increase in high-quality language and area offerings in colleges and universities that train significant numbers of teachers. (2) Such institutions should arrange cooperative programs with universities having well-developed language and area resources, either on a state or a national level, so that exceptionally talented and highly motivated students may take advanced work not available at their home institutions. (3) The shortage of qualified teachers justifies far-reaching measures to encourage young people to choose secondary and elementary school language teaching as a career. Special undergraduate scholarships and other forms of financial aid should prove to be strong incentives for those planning such careers. (4) An extensive in-service program of summer and academic-year institutes emphasizing interdisciplinary approaches, should be used to train and retarin secondary and elementary school teachers. Such programs, already available to college teachers from institutions that wish to use their own staff to inaugurate area and language studies, should be expanded. (5) University language and area centers should be encouraged to participate on an experimental and demonstration basis directly in the colleges and schools.

VIII. Firsthand contact with relevant foreign cultures is an indispensable means of increasing motivation and improving professional competence.

Recommendations: (1) A systematic effort should be undertaken to provide oversea experience for prospective and practicing language and area teachers on all levels, during both the summer and the academic year. The oversea work should be appropriately supervised and may take one of several forms: enrollment at foreign universities, Government-sponsored oversea study programs, exchange teaching programs, and the like. However, oversea experience should be supplementary to, and closely integrated with, prior formal training in the United States. (2) On a smaller scale, oversea experience for selected college and secondary school students is desirable.

IX. The traditional barriers between curricular, extracurricular, and cocurricular education hinder progress in language and area studies. Successful programs show that some of the strongest sources of early motivation and sustained interest among students, particularly high school students, are often to be found outside the classroom setting.

Recommendations: Programs in which visiting foreigners reside at an institution for a period of months or for an academic year, appear to have great promise in arousing the interest of high school and college students; such programs foster personal contact with foreign languages and cultures that supplements curricular offerings or, in cases where curricular facilities are not yet available, provides a substitute in establishiing early awareness. Experimental programs of visits, either on an exchange or on a unilateral basis, should be given substantial support. The programs should by no means be restricted to professional teachers; they should encompass foreign scholars, artists, and others. (*The Educational Record*, Spring 1966.)

Conference Report

by the Conference on Critical Languages in Liberal Arts Colleges[*]

On April 6–7, 1965 a conference on critical languages in liberal arts colleges was held at the University of Washington. The conference was jointly sponsored by the Far Eastern and Russian Institute of the university and the Association of American Colleges with the hope of finding a consensus among linguists, language teachers, and college administrators as to the problems of introducing critical or neglected languages into the curricula of small liberal arts colleges. The recommendations of the conference were as follows:

1. Even with present limitations of staff and materials, as well as constraints of curriculum, it is feasible to introduce the study of critical languages into American liberal arts colleges in such a way that it will be a valid component of liberal education.
2. Instruction in a critical language should be introduced in a liberal arts college only if the equivalent of at least 2 full years of work in a specialized university program can be offered.
3. Emphasis in the early stages of instruction should be on oral control, but in every case, work in reading should be introduced in the first year.
4. When languages present special learning problems because of complicated writing systems or a classical-colloquial split, restricted objectives should be decided on to avoid dispersion of effort and discouraging results.
5. Of alternative patterns of instruction, the most desirable is usually a professional teacher of the language, regular class sessions at least 4 or 5 hours a week, and supplementary work in a language laboratory or with the instructor. It is also feasible to have a linguist or language specialists on the faculty supervise instruction by an informant, i.e., a foreign student or other speaker of the language present on the campus. In this case some special training for the informant must be provided.
6. In cases where it is not feasible to set up a full program of instruction in a critical language, and in cases where for some special purpose a more unusual language must be offered, a supervised program of individual study with special materials and tapes like the Kalamazoo program can be effective. It should be noted that, while this is a promising means of meeting the special needs of a small fraction of the student body, it provides no solution to the problem of including one of the critical languages as a standard component in a liberal arts curriculum.
7. Valuable adjuncts to undergraduate instruction in critical languages now exist in the form of intensive summer courses at univer-

---

[*] © 1965 Association of American Colleges.

sities, the undergraduate year at Princeton and other institutions and provisions for study abroad for the undergraduate who has completed elementary preparation. Any liberal arts college which introduces study of the critical languages should take full advantage of these adjuncts.

8. It is desirable that standardized tests of proficiency in the critical languages be developed so that small colleges may have an effective means of measuring their work in comparison with that of other institutions. (*Conference on Critical Languages in Liberal Arts Colleges.*)

TEACHING RESOURCES

Strengthening the Faculty and Teaching Resources

by the Committee on the College and World Affairs

A major portion of the 1964 report, The College and World Affairs, was devoted to consideration of what the individual college can do to broaden the international dimension in its undergraduate education.

The decision to give undergraduate education a world orientation will involve substantial changes in the various ongoing programs and activities of the American college. This will be true because many questions concerning the curriculum, overseas study, and cocurricular activities will arise. * * * At the outset, * * * it is important to recognize that each college must find the approaches that accord best with its circumstances and capabilities, for there are many ways in which the broadened context of undergraduate education can be developed.

The capability of the college to broaden the scope of undergraduate education depends primarily on the attitude of the faculty and on its competence to teach about foreign societies and cultures and the profound changes that are occurring throughout the world. The curriculum is largely a reflection of the outlook and training of the faculty. In the final analysis these are what determine its scope and content.

The outlook of many faculties has changed dramatically in recent years. This is reflected most clearly in the vigor of faculty interest in non-Western areas and in their eagerness to improve the quality of instruction in this regard. Unfortunately, the great majority of professors in the humanities and social sciences have not studied the history and culture, or political, economic, and social development of non-Western areas. Most of them feel that they cannot revise their courses to include non-Western experience and data while maintaining standards of instruction expected in teaching about the United States and Europe. Very few professors, moreover, have had the specialized training required to teach foreign area courses. And teachers who can offer instruction in critical languages like Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, and Hindi are scarce.

What, then, should the college do? A critical examination of existing resources is the first step. Is the college making effective use in its educational programs and activities of faculty who have had foreign training or experience? In the case of the college within the university, this is long overdue. In many cases, it is not lack of resources but neglect or ineffective use of them which is the basic difficulty. To build upon the strength of faculty interest and competence should be the second step. The college must provide its faculty with opportunities to revise courses and develop new ones, and to prepare satisfactory teaching materials. Simultaneously, as a third step, the college should seek to stimulate even greater faculty interest and to develop new competence regarding foreign areas and cultures. It should encourage existing faculty to expand the scope of their experience, and in appointing new faculty it should put greater weight upon overseas training and experience, other qualifications being equal.

The reorientation of a faculty cannot of course be accomplished overnight, and major course changes require a great deal of planning. It is not always easy for teachers with heavy assignments to take time to acquire the competence that they feel they need, to put together new materials, or to master comparative techniques. This is particularly true of those who for financial reasons have to spend their summer vacations in additional teaching assignments. It is also true for those who prefer to put all their spare time into research on their particular specialties.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

The problem of faculty time is a serious one, but not insurmountable if the college is committed to broadening the scope of its educational program. For one thing, over a period of time it should encourage as many faculty as possible to take advantage of opportunities for foreign study, research, teaching, and, where appropriate, participation in overseas programs. Further, because the gains to the institution are great, it should provide financial assistance and other incentives when needed, rewarding not in fact penalizing, faculty for their efforts. The faculty member who has taught abroad is likely to be a better teacher for having gained a broader view of his subject. Because he has faced new kinds of teaching problems, his ability to impart this knowledge to students will be improved. New courses, and new ways of teaching old courses, may result from the insights he acquires. Both inside and outside the classroom, the teacher with experience abroad can have a significant impact on the world outlook of students. His courses lose some of their cultural bias; he gives his students perspective on their own society and culture. He becomes more effective in preparing students for study abroad and in teaching foreign students, since he understands some of the problems they face. And, finally, whether or not he was engaged in research, new ideas for research projects often develop.

The faculty can enlarge their competence in their own disciplines in a number of ways. Some ways that have already proved effective are the on-campus faculty seminar; the summer faculty seminar, organized either by discipline or foreign area, at a major university center in the United States or at a comparable institution in the foreign area to be studied; an academic year of study at a major university center, supplemented in some cases by a teaching internship, and followed ideally by several months of study and travel in a foreign area; and lastly, an academic year of study abroad.

THE ON-CAMPUS FACULTY SEMINAR

The on-campus faculty seminar is a widely used and successful means of stimulating campus interest and developing faculty competence in international studies. In many cases, the on-campus seminar has been the central feature of a cooperative faculty development program involving as few as two and as many as six institutions, and they have continued over periods ranging from 2 to 5 years.[1] While no two programs are exactly alike, each has certain common features. The central focus is the study of a non-Western area or society—China, Japan, India, Africa, or the Islamic world—during the academic year by faculty representing primarily the humanities and the social sciences. Released time from teaching and other commitments is generally provided. The Atlanta colleges, for example, have been concentrating on China, India, and Africa over a 3-year period. While local faculty members usually administer the program, often on a rotating basis, outside specialists provide advice (for example, bibliographic) and lead the various substantive sessions of the seminar. In some cases, a visiting specialist will be in residence for the year, giving a course as part of the college's regular teaching program. This is the pattern of the program at Lynchburg, Randolph-Macon, and Sweet Briar. In other cases, one specialist, though not in residence, may provide basic direction and continuity. His contribution will be supplemented by the visits of others, as in the case of the Pennsylvania-Maryland colleges and the Chattanooga group. In still other cases, especially where there is already a specialist on the scene, a series of visitors may be adequate. In all cases, the visiting specialists have been utilized in more general campus activities, such as convocation and similar lecture series, or even in public education programs such as a television course, as in the case of the Altanta group.

Experience indicates that this approach to faculty development is an effective one. First, it has helped to strengthen institutional commitment to world affairs education by developing common interests among the faculty, breaking down departmental barriers and creating a greater awareness of the contribution of the various disciplines. It has facilitated institution-wide planning, usually through clarification of basic educational goals. It has prepared the faculty for curricular changes and influenced departmental hiring policy. Second, it has provided a means for faculty to broaden their knowledge of non-Western societies and cultures and to begin revising their courses. Success depends, of course, upon program leadership and upon the initiative and perseverance of the individual faculty participants. The faculty seminar does have limitations. Even with provision for released time, there is a limit to how much faculty participants can do. But it has stimulated many of them to seek further training either at a university center in the United States or in the foreign area itself. In this sense, the seminar acts as a kind of screening device.

STUDY AT UNIVERSITY CENTERS

Study for an academic year at a foreign-area training center of an American university offers even greater opportunities for faculty development. The Carnegie Corp.-supported faculty fellowship programs at Columbia, Chicago, and Michigan, and those supported by the Ford Foundation at Harvard and Indiana, have demonstrated the advantages of this approach. Both programs provided the elements necessary for effective training: guidance by specialists who are among the best in their fields, superb library facilities, and exciting classroom and seminar situations. In the case of the former they have given the faculty fellows an internship teaching experience which prepares them to use non-Western materials and new approaches in teaching their own courses. Of greatest importance is the fact that all the fellows had a period of time, without other commitments, sufficient to pursue an intensive study program involving wide-ranging reading and classroom observation, if not participation. They had a chance, moreover, to develop new courses, patterned on those given at the host institution. The year of study has paid even greater dividends when it has been supplemented by a summer of travel and study in the foreign area. The fellows have returned to their own colleges, not of course as area specialists, but with sufficient competence and sophistication to play a vital role in their own colleges' effort to expand international studies programs. In several cases—at Spelman, Denison, and Chattanooga—the fellows have taken the lead in organizing on-campus faculty seminars.

---

[1] The on-campus seminar has been the central feature of faculty development at (1) Earlham and Antioch Colleges; (2) Spelman, Morehouse, Morris Brown, and Clark Colleges and Atlanta University; (3) the University of Vermont and Bennington, Goddard, Middlebury, and St. Michael's Colleges and Norwich University; (4) Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore; (5) Lynchburg, Randolph-Macon, and Sweet Briar; (6) Dickinson, Gettysburg, Hood, Mount St. Mary's and St. Joseph Colleges and Western Maryland University; and (7) the University of Chattanooga and Birmingham-Southern, Knox, and Marysville Colleges.

College teachers who are not able to devote a full academic year to study at an American university center can often give a summer or several summers for that purpose. While they cannot accomplish as much in a summer as in a year, they can develop some new competence, especially if they are fortunate enough to participate in a skillfully conducted seminar or workshop program, guided by competent specialists and composed of academic colleagues of high quality. Several such disciplinary seminars have been held during the past few years: at Syracuse on Soviet economics, at Columbia on Russian literature and on Middle East politics, at Cornell on Latin American social institutions and on Chinese literature. There have also been Indian studies seminars for faculty at Chicago and Pennsylvania, and short faculty institutes in Middle East studies at Thiel in 1960, Illinois in 1961, and Williams in 1962. There was an 8-week faculty seminar at the University of Utah in 1963.

It may be useful to describe one of these summer seminars in some detail. The Columbia seminar on Russian literature ran for 9 weeks during July and August of 1962 and was composed of 16 college teachers representing a variety of institutions throughout New York State, public and private, large and small. Two senior scholars conducted the seminar, one directing the 1st half on 19th century literature and the other the 2d half on the 20th century. The program, financed largely out of State funds, was designed to provide mature teachers already trained in the general field of literature, with a systematic introduction to a major literary tradition outside the conventional limits of graduate study in that field, and with an opportunity to read extensively in that tradition. It was not expected that the seminar participants would develop new courses specifically in Russian literature, but rather that they would attempt to introduce more material drawn from Russian literature into introductory courses in comparative or world literature and strengthen whatever coverage they might already be giving to this material. While the program's objective was limited and was successfully attained, in some cases the experience further whetted appetites, stimulating teachers to begin serious study of the Russian language.

TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND STUDY ABROAD

Another promising approach is that of faculty teaching, research, and study abroad, especially in non-Western societies, for a full academic year. Fulbright and other exchange programs provide excellent opportunities for teaching and research abroad, helping to maintain and develop faculty competence on a national scale. There is need, however, for faculty study programs combining the resources and attributes of the American university area studies center and the practical advantages of direct experience in the foreign environment. One such program has recently been established by the American Institute of Indian Studies centered at Poona. While its major emphasis is upon research and the training of specialists in Indian studies, the institute recognizes another important objective: to facilitate the incorporation of "some knowledge of India and some sense of its relevance to our own national concerns in the general education of large numbers of Americans." With this particular end in mind, it has inaugurated a fellowship program to enable college faculty members, without specialized training in Indian studies, to spend a year in India, studying an Indian language and other aspects of Indian culture and society. The personnel of the institute, American and Indian, provide instruction and guidance. The training program is adapted to individual needs and normally includes intensive work in one of the major Indian languages. Fellowship assistance is available, but candidates must be sponsored by their home institution. Moreover, the Institute recommends that faculty fellows participate in either of two summer programs on India: that at the University of Pennsylvania or that offered cooperatively by Chicago, California, and Wisconsin. Faculty fellows whose work in India will involve language study are expected to take an introductory course in one of the major Indian languages. Another program, that of the American Research Center in the United Arab Republic may soon be expanded along similar lines.

The summer period can also be used fruitfully for travel and study abroad, but careful planning and guidance are necessary. The Fulbright-Hays program, administered by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, provides several excellent opportunities for college teachers to study in Asia. A summer institute in Indian civilization is held at several Indian universities and a summer institute in Chinese civilization is held at Tunghai University on Taiwan. The purpose of these institutes is to give undergraduate teachers who have had no previous experience in Asia a brief but intensive survey of Indian or Chinese history, institutions, and culture, plus firsthand contact with a non-Western society in order to enrich their teaching at their own colleges. Approximately 20 grants are awarded annually for each program, with special consideration given to candidates from colleges that are trying to develop or improve course offerings in Asian studies. The American Association for Middle East Studies is developing a similar program with assistance from the Department of State. In the summer of 1963 it conducted an overseas institute offering intensive instruction, plus an opportunity for firsthand acquaintance with the people and institutions of the Middle East area, to American faculty teaching courses on the Middle East who have not had the benefit of formal area training. The program emphasized formal study at leading universities in Israel and Egypt and included opportunities for participants to pursue individual disciplinary interests. Clearly, there is need for more well-conceived summer programs to give a larger number of faculty an opportunity to travel and study in lesser known areas of the world.

NEW FACULTY

To accelerate the process of change a college should also adopt an appointing policy designed to broaden the international base of the academic program, as well as to fill in gaps and develop new strengths. First, the college stands to gain by adding an additional criterion to those it already uses in its evaluation of prospective staff members. When positions become available the college should, all other qualifications being reasonably met, appoint faculty who have had foreign training or experience to *all* departments, whether in the humanities, social sciences, or sciences. Second, the college should add some faculty with special foreign competence, combined with sound training in a discipline. They might, for example, add comparativists and specialists on foreign areas, on intercultural relations, and on the processes of socioeconomic development. Such faculty can double in brass. They can carry their share of teaching in the basic courses of their disciplines, enriching these courses because of their training and experience. They can also offer other courses that will stretch the limits of general education, broaden the scope of discipline majors, or contribute to an organized area studies program.

Initially it will not be easy for colleges to find such people in sufficient numbers. It is clear that our graduate schools are not turning out enough prospective teachers in either of these two categories. Certainly a heavy share of the responsibility for encouraging greater attention to the international context of undergraduate education lies with graduate schools and their respective departments. Unfortunately, in many cases they are still producing teachers almost exclusively concerned with Western institutions and cultures. They do train non-Western area specialists in the various disciplines, but the supply is small compared with the growing demand for their services. No doubt they will train larger numbers of such area specialists in the course of time, but they must provide a different kind of product as well. They must turn out teachers with strong training in their disciplines who, though not area specialists in terms of language and research skills, have a good grounding in at least one non-Western area, or in the processes of social and economic development, or in international or intercultural relations. This will require some modification of existing Ph. D. programs in order to allow prospective teachers to acquire this competence without undue loss of time or dispersion of effort. In some cases, this will involve modification of subfields in the discipline, in others, new approaches to the minor program of Ph. D. candidates.

In brief, despite the expansion of educational resources on the graduate level for research and training in international studies and foreign areas, the present scale of effort needs to be enlarged. Every graduate school has a responsibility to enrich the humanities and social sciences with the fruits of scholarship and experience in world affairs. Even in the natural sciences, which have always incorporated the contributions of foreign scholarship into their fields of knowledge, more faculty members should become aware of the worldwide social implications of scientific discoveries and technological change. Certain universities must continue to strengthen their centers for research and training on foreign areas. Since no graduate school can equip itself to offer every specialty, a strong case can be made for some division of labor among universities having strength in different fields.

VISITING FACULTY

Visiting scholars can often contribute to a college's effort to develop international studies as an integral part of liberal learning. Area specialists based at universities can be especially helpful. They can provide guidance in overall planning and can contribute to the teaching resources of the institution. Many of the cooperative programs for the development of non-Western studies, for example, have utilized visiting faculty for just these purposes. Outstanding examples of progress at particular institutions are provided by Mills and Chatham Colleges. Both reaped benefits from the John Hay Whitney Foundation's visiting professor program. Harold Fisher at Mills, in addition to teaching Russian history and international relations, conducted a faculty seminar on ways in which non-Western perspectives could be introduced into the curriculum. Out of this experience came a general plan for faculty development and revision of the curriculum. Similarly, Lawrence Kinnaird assisted Chatham in developing its non-Western studies program.

Visiting foreign scholars are another resource that should not be overlooked. Given competence and the ability to communicate, foreign scholars can bring knowledge and experience which will enrich the curriculum. They can often contribute special skills and training which may otherwise be difficult to obtain, teaching courses on the languages and literature, philosophy, religion, history, and geography of other areas of the world. Further, they can bring new points of view to courses already offered. A great many courses could benefit from the professional competence and wider horizons provided by professors from abroad. Visiting foreign scholars also raise questions about American education that may provoke thoughtful discussion. Moreover, they can bring their American colleagues up to date on scholarly and professional developments abroad.

The foreign background which makes the faculty member from abroad an asset, also creates problems of adjustment both for the institution and for the individual. These should not be minimized, for the foreign teacher must fit into a system quite different from that at home. He is faced in his daily work with differences in educational philosophy, curriculum, and methods of teaching. Both the visiting professor and his students lack background in each other's cultures. The visitor needs some concept of what is already in the minds of American students. While helping him to orient himself to his new environment, the institution may find it necessary to make certain adjustments to take full advantage of what the visitor has to offer.

Ways of making more imaginative use of foreign faculty in the development of international studies, especially at smaller colleges, require further exploration and experimentation. A visiting foreign scholars program, sponsored jointly by the John Hay Whitney Foundation and the Fulbright scholar program is focusing upon just this problem. Inaugurated in 1951, the program is designed to enable a few exceptionally qualified foreign scholars to teach at American colleges or universities which do not have ready access to visiting scholars. Among the factors determining the selection of host institutions is the likelihood that the visitor will be shared with neighboring colleges or universities, and the presence of an active interest in some aspect of the exchange of persons and ideas or in the development of a program of international education. Recently, selection has stressed commitment to develop a "program of teaching non-European materials."

Also helpful in stimulating international commitment and planning on campus are short-term visitors, both American and foreign. Individual examples are too numerous to catalog, but it may be useful to mention the program of the American Association of Middle East Studies, designed to assist colleges and universities to bring specialists to the campus for 2- to 4-day visits. The program appears to have fulfilled an important need. Reports from visiting scholars and from host institutions indicate that lectures and talks with faculty serve to stimulate a serious and often a lasting interest in Middle East studies at the undergraduate level. In a number of cases, visits have resulted in the enrichment of general survey courses with material on the Middle East and aroused administrative support for the introduction of more specialized courses. Moreover, a substantial number of those applying to the association's summer faculty institutes have come from colleges and universities that have received such visits. While the association assumed all costs in 1961–62 and 1962–63, it placed the program on a self-supporting basis in 1963–64 by asking the host institutions to pay the expenses involved. (*The College and World Affairs.*)

Teacher Education for International Goals

*by H. Kenneth Barker**

Mr. Barker is associate executive secretary of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Whitehead wrote that "any serious fundamental change in an intellectual outlook of human society must necessarily be followed by an educational revolution." For some time we have talked about the fundamental changes that must take place in higher education, especially teacher education, if we are to produce a citizenry that is knowledgeable about world affairs. Although many positive changes have taken place in the past few years, no educational revolution has occurred in this area.

Just a few years ago Percy Bidwell did a study for the Carnegie Corp. This study resulted in a publication titled "Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs." Bidwell, after testing 1,900 students from 175 colleges and universities across the United States, concluded, "The opinion is widespread that in the field of foreign affairs American colleges in general have not done a good job for the common run of undergraduate, either in preparing him for his civic responsibilities or for positive service abroad or in equipping him with the knowledge and understanding of foreign countries which is the hallmark of a liberal education."

Mr. Bidwell goes on to say that there is evidence that higher education in the United States is more provincial than that of any other comparable country. If the above statement is only partially accurate, I submit that we as a nation have an educational problem of the first magnitude. A world power is courting disaster if it knows little of the world.

American men are dying today in Vietnam. Our troops are still stationed in force in South Korea and in Germany. Santo Domingo is perhaps only a prelude to further American involvement throughout Latin America. Other battles—few of them, fortunately, of the hot variety—are being fought in over seventy countries by means of our foreign assistance programs, with a commitment this year of over \$3½ billion. Our Peace Corps volunteers can be found in the most remote parts of the world.

In teach-ins, student protest meetings, and other public gatherings the age-old question "Why?" is being asked. Because some of the answers should be self-evident to an educated citizenry, we are again forced to take a hard look at the products of our educational system. Our tremendous wealth and military power are not enough. To have the wisdom to deal with the increasingly complex problems of the world demands minds that have to date been produced in all too small numbers.

---

*© 1965 Phi Delta Kappa, Inc.

What, specifically, can educators concerned with producing American teachers do? First, college administrators and faculty members must assume a responsibility for the stability of world affairs that matches the dedication of the men who are giving their very lives in the rice paddies of Vietnam. To educators, the promotion of world understanding can no longer be a side interest or an "Oh, yes, that's something to which we should give some thought." It cannot take second place to accreditation, the new math, student enrollment problems, projected budgets, or the obtaining of commencement speakers. Every student who leaves the campus with the same parochial education we received 20 or 30 years ago, designed for a pre-World War II era (and perhaps inadequate for that), will not be equipped intellectually or psychologically to contribute his full potential to a better world.

The problem can be stated very simply; the solution is complex to the *n*th degree. How do we educate teachers who, regardless of the grade level or subject matter they teach, can enter our classrooms with skills and insights that will allow them to do more than merely purvey information? How do we produce teachers who, from the very beginning of the educational process, challenge young minds to examine the real meaning of the "dignity of man," be he black, white, or yellow? When we teach world history, what world are we talking about? Is it Western Europe, which excludes all of Africa, the Near East, the Far East, and Latin America? When we teach values, do we include those value systems which are quite different from ours, those of more populous nations, those which may be three thousand years older than ours? Can we produce teachers and create a system of education that will allow, even encourage, the examination of our mistakes as well as our successes? What now happens to a teacher who tries to be "a little too objective"? How many parts of the United States still resist teaching about the United Nations? Can we teach the dignity of man in a town where a 6-year-old can walk into a store and buy an ice cream cone, but, because of his color, cannot stand there and eat it? How can we convince professors of literature that an understanding of the world in which we live demands an understanding of the literature of India, China, and Japan, as well as that of the Western World (a world sometimes restricted to the British Isles)? The same question can be asked of professors of art, music, and science.

As the result of visits to parts of southeast Asia and Africa, I became enchanted with various aspects of the culture of these regions. Unfortunately, I never learned about Asian and African art, music, and culture in the textbooks I used. After visiting these parts of the world, I realize that the people there know just how little attention we give to them in our so-called liberal education. Whether we like it or not, there are still 700 million people living in China and over 400 million in India. Indonesia, now the world's fifth largest nation, has 100 million. When we teach history, art, music, science, sociology, why can't we broaden our sights and develop courses that will recognize the contributions from these major cultural areas?

The Committee on International Relations of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has discussed the above problem for a number of years. In addition to the need for educating teachers in the international dimension, the problem of involving member institutions in overseas projects has been given major consideration. As every teacher knows, in the last 10 years education has assumed an ever-increasing role in programs for national development. In our AID programs the amount for military assistance has decreased from 66 to 35 percent in the past 10 years. There has been a growing awareness that education can contribute more to the emerging nations of the world than can tanks or guns. Undoubtedly, the success of the Peace Corps has been due to its major emphasis on providing teachers where education seemed to be the number one concern. The World Bank now considers human resources development its major objective. Even a new literature is developing, with the appearance of such works as *Education, Manpower and Economic Growth*, by Harbison and Myer, and *American Education in International Development*, by Freeman Butts.

Its concern for the education of America's teachers in international understanding and the increased overseas involvement of many of its member institutions have led the AACTE to a number of activities and programs that it hopes will be helpful to member institutions. I shall describe some of these activities briefly. Through the association's national meetings, School for Executives, regional meetings, and statewide conferences, an attempt has been made to stimulate an interest in the international dimension of education. Recent meetings held at Stanford University, the University of Nebraska, and the University of Pittsburgh have dealt with major areas of the world: Latin America, Africa, the Pacific

Since the association works very closely with college presidents and deans, it has been so bold as to "educate" some of these esteemed gentlemen. Administrators are asked to prepare teachers for the Peace Corps, to become involved in overseas contracts, to send faculty members on Fulbright lectureships, and to "internationalize" their curricula. The International Relations Committee felt that persons responsible for such programs should have an opportunity to study education in another culture. Presidents and deans rarely have a chance to take the 1 or 2 years necessary for a Fulbright or an AID assignment. Sometimes, I expect, college presidents and deans avoid such assignments because they are afraid it will be seen that the college could continue to run without them. To date, the AACTE has sent over 100 college administrators to spend 30 days studying higher education in such countries as India, Pakistan, Poland, the United Arab Republic, Israel, and Germany. On other programs, administrators have visited other parts of the world, including Latin America, Africa, and the Far East.

Very careful examination of these experiences confirms that they are valuable. I recently talked with the president of a Midwest college who, after visiting Pakistan, is considering leaving his present position to accept an overseas assignment. He stated before visiting Pakistan that for him our overseas AID program was just an "abstraction." Having been with the group that went to India, I can remember the reaction we all had to seeing people living in the streets and in a mud village where conditions were primitive beyond belief. We feel sure this field study program has been effective and we expect to continue it in the future.

Working in cooperation with the Department of State, we have established what we call Interinstitutional Affiliation Projects, in which more than thirty American colleges and universities have established affiliations with sister institutions in Africa, Europe, Latin America, and the Near and Far East. These affiliations have involved the exchange of books, printed materials, curricular materials, art displays, video tapes, and, on a number of occasions, an exchange of professors and students. One of these affiliations, between Winona State College in Minnesota and the Oslo Teacher Training College, reached such a high level of success that the king of Norway presented a special medal to Winona President N. Minné. I was delighted to see, at a teacher training college in Bangkok, that a major portion of the library had been supplied by their affiliate, Central Michigan University.

In an attempt to face squarely the problem of producing teachers who are knowledgeable about world affairs, a pilot project was started at the State University College in Plattsburg, N.Y. Ten other institutions are now developing similar projects. These schools were selected on the basis of geographic location, type of administrative structure, and stated interest in bringing to their campuses an international dimension. By design, we have involved a Catholic college, Protestant institution, several public institutions, a college that is predominantly Negro, and schools in geographical areas of the country that would present very obvious problems. Most of these are fairly small colleges. We are aware that the larger and more complex universities have the resources to hire specialists who can develop international programs. It is our feeling, however, that many of the smaller colleges have a vital role to play, since the teachers they produce go into the same classrooms as do those produced by the larger universities. We hope that some of these colleges will develop effective programs with local resources and without sizable foundation grants, as desirable as those might be. If these programs are effective, it is hoped that they will be emulated by other institutions of similar kind. These institutions have found that change does not come easily, but they are beginning to do some very exciting things.

Last fall, we launched another new program that has already proven valuable. Under a grant from AID, college administrators from emerging nations of the world are given a chance to observe every aspect of the administration of an American college. Each country involved identifies a promising administrator who will be assuming a leadership role in its system of higher education. This man is assigned to work as an administrative intern with an American college president or dean. Before the intern comes here, the American administrator visits the country overseas in an attempt to acquaint himself with the educational system and problems with which his intern will eventually be working. It is our hope and the hope of AID that this exposure will help the American administrator provide a more realistic and relevant internship. We have just completed the first year of this program and are happy to say that the program will continue next year on an expanded basis. Men like President James H. Albertson of Stevens Point (Wisconsin) have made this program a tremendous success. Fortunately for us, the interns were men of unusual ability and skill. Without exception, the Americans have stated that this was a reciprocal internship, since they learned a great deal from their interns. Having visited several of these interns recently, I was delighted to see how closely they had become identified not only with the person with whom they were working but with the institution. One of the interns told me with great pride that he considered himself an alumnus of the institution and that if he ever came back to the States the first thing he would do would be to come back "home."

Through a contract with the Department of State the AACTE is currently developing a program whereby seven American colleges and universities will assist seven American-sponsored schools in various parts of the world. These schools are vitally important to the Americans who are serving in such cities as Mogadiscio, Karachi, Amman, and elsewhere. In addition to the service these schools render Americans who are abroad, they have become a vital link in this country's attempt to promote mutual understanding. I recently visited the American-sponsored school in Mogadiscio, Somali, and saw the daughter of one of the key ministers in the first grade learning to read English alongside some of her American classmates. Through this program we hope to keep these overseas schools informed of the current trends and innovations in American education. Like other programs designed to help schools overseas, I am sure this one will prove a very worthwhile experience for the American colleges involved. When we started discussing this program with the Department of State, we were asked whether we could find six or seven American institutions willing world at peace.

Last year we were asked to conduct a seminar in Guatemala designed to upgrade the social studies teachers of the five republics of Central America, Panama, and the Dominican Republic. Distinguished professors in such fields as history, political science, economics, and education conducted the seminar in Spanish. Seventy secondary teachers returned to their countries after the seminar with increased knowledge and better concepts of what we are trying to do in the social studies area. This coming August, a similar seminar will be held in Honduras with the same successful team of professors.

The association has prevailed upon Harold Taylor * * * to begin soon a comprehensive study of the role teacher education should be playing in international understanding. We very much need a conceptual framework and a philosophical underpinning for the role we must play in this area. We have all talked glibly about the role we should play, but I think that not enough attention has been given to the philosophical implications of what we are undertaking.

Still other programs are being considered by the AACTE's International Relations Committee. Hopefully, they will provide guidance and support for what many teacher educators are trying to do. We need and encourage these teacher educators to give the AACTE ideas, support, and cooperation. The thing most needed is dedication to the vital role education can and must play if we are to live in a world at peace. (*Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1965.)

LIBRARY RESOURCES

Area Studies and Library Resources

*by Chauncy D. Harris**

Mr. Harris is professor of geography and chairman of the Committee on Non-Western Area Programs and Other International Studies at the University of Chicago.

It would be presumptuous for me to outline in any detail the problems that confront libraries as a result of the growth of area studies, but even in my limited experience I have become aware of four types of special problems: acquisition and processing, financial support, organization, and training of librarians.

Area studies pose peculiarly difficult tasks of acquisition and processing because a high proportion of the works are in foreign languages and are published in distant lands with diverse customs in the book trade. The languages often are not within the knowledge of a regularly available library staff. Frequently they use systems of writing that cannot be deciphered by every librarian, such as Arabic script used in Arabic, Persian, or Urdu; or the Devanagari script used in official Hindi; or the characters in Chinese; or in a mixture of characters and *kana* in Japanese. Thus very special language skills are needed at all stages in the securing, processing, and maintaining of library resources to meet the needs of area studies.

Five special problems appear to recur:

1. *Retrospective purchases to fill in gaps.*—At the launching of a program of area studies, nearly all libraries face an initial problem of the absence in their collections of the major works on the history and literature of the area in question. There may be a desperate scramble among libraries for the few known copies of important works. Programs may be set up for reproduction of key works in microfilm, on Microcard, in Xerox, or by photo-offset printing, depending on the anticipated demand. The total corpus of such potential material may be immense. It is expected, for example, that a new Soviet selective union catalog of Russian books published prior to 1957 will contain some 1,200,000 entries.

2. *Selection of appropriate items currently being published.*—The total number of titles being published has been expanding at a geometric, if not astronomic, rate. In the Soviet Union, for example, the *annual* output of books of all types rose from about 5,000 titles in 1920 to about 78,000 titles in 1964. The problem of selection is complicated by the multidisciplinary nature of area studies, which means that someone in the library must have a good grasp of many fields and effective communication with a diverse array of scholars. Even where programs under Public Law 480 call for essentially comprehensive purchasing of the entire printed output of a country, the problem

*© 1965 The University of Chicago.

of selection remains, since few, if any, libraries will wish to retain all such material.

3. *Acquisitions.*—Even if a title is verified, the problems of acquisition have only begun. Each country has its own distinctive methods of publishing and distributing books. The People's Republic of China, for example, poses a peculiarly difficult problem of securing books and periodicals. In the Soviet Union books are often fully distributed on the day of publication and become immediately out of print. But there is at least an official channel for obtaining books. Many countries have no such channels, and a great variety of book dealers must be utilized, some very competent and helpful.

4. *Processing.*—Arrearages have built up in some areas in some libraries simply because of the acute shortage of available competent staff with appropriate language skills. For want of personnel to process the material, at least two libraries participating in book purchases under Public Law 480 are simply storing without unpacking the entire receipts for one country. The materials from some countries are heavily in the category of pamphlets. How much cataloging time and effort should be invested in a small pamphlet? From professional pride and a desire to maintain high standards, catalogers may sometimes neglect or even oppose possible simplifications.

5. *Bibliographical control.*—Fortunately for some areas, such as India, national bibliographies have been established. But American libraries have had to cooperate in establishing many tools, such as the Cyrillic Union Catalog prepared at the Library of Congress with a special grant but, unfortunately, still available only in microcard form. For Chinese periodicals there is the union list of holdings of American, British, and Japanese libraries. Such efforts are costly in time and money.

As a result of all these special problems, area studies make heavy demands on the fiscal resources of libraries. To meet these needs libraries have strained their own regular budgets but have required, also, massive inputs of special funds from foundations, from the Government, and from increased investment of university funds. It is my own conclusion, after 20 years of concern with library problems in area studies, that the library needs are regularly seriously underestimated in the launching and budgeting of area studies. Faculty and budget committees need to be educated to the facts of life that the purchase price of books in exotic languages is only a tiny fraction of the total cost of selection, acquisition, cataloging, and maintenance of area collections.

There is also the problem of sheer communication between faculty and library. It is not rare for a faculty committee to develop and undertake an area program that may make extraordinary demands on the library facilities without even consulting or informing the librarian or without making any provision for help in solving some of the financial and personnel problems caused by the program.

Area studies present a special organizational quandary to libraries. Should works on an area be kept together as a special collection or should they be distributed throughout the library according to whatever classification system is utilized? If there is an area collection, should it contain all works on that area or only those in the national language of the area? That is, should a book on the economy of

China be in a Far Eastern library or in the economics section of a main library? Or should some books simply be grouped by language? There is no simple solution to these questions that is completely satisfactory to all. The problem of whether a university library should be centralized or broken down into departmental libraries contains some analogous aspects of multiple and specialized use.

An obvious need exists to consider the training of librarians for the complex and special problems that result from area studies. The foreign area fellowship program awarded 1,214 fellowships for graduate study during the years 1952–63; yet, so far as I can determine, none was specifically to a librarian for training to meet the library needs arising out of the demands of this corps of specialists. American libraries have depended for some areas on the capital linguistic skills brought to the United States by several waves of immigrants and refugees. But with the aging of this population, recruitment of new librarian linguists may be more difficult, and special provision may need to be made for their training period. In some newly developing areas we have never had librarians with special training.

And we should not forget that librarians with special area and language competence need an unusually generous endowment of the rare gifts of tact and diplomacy, for they must deal with reluctant and seemingly penurious library administrators, with inaccessible and unreliable sources of publications, and above all with demanding, unreasonable, and occasionally even neurotic faculty and students who insist on immediate availability of even the most obscure work. (*The Library Quarterly*, October 1965)

The General Research Library and Area-Studies Programs

*by Frederick H. Wagman**

Mr. Wagman is director of the University Library at the University of Michigan.

If the relatively simple interdisciplinary development that leads to the establishment of new disciplines, which now seem to us perfectly acceptable, creates only negligible problems for the library, the trend toward the establishment of centers in which numerous disciplines are focused upon the broad problems of science and society has been quite another matter. These are familiar to us as institutes of science and technology; institutes for human growth and development or for social research; centers for conflict resolution, urban development, foreign economic development, or area studies, to mention only a few. Most of these are based on the premise that existing curricular and department organization, like library subject classification, has virtue and should not be abandoned, yet is inadequate to meet current research and instructional needs.

These centers and institutes, already a heavy overlay on the traditional university pattern, undoubtedly enhance the contribution of university research to our society, but they create varied administrative difficulties for the university as a whole and for its library. The new centers and institutes are justifiably opportunistic. In their infancy they resemble the young of man—zoölogical species in their great need and capacity for growth, and they are equally demanding. They are attractive because of our irrepressible hope that new approaches to age-old problems may yield dramatic solutions. They seem to find it easy to persuade governmental, foundation, and university officials to invest in their projects and, flushed with this success, they sometimes lay demands upon the university library that make the librarians mutter darkly about hubris. But they do reflect an awareness of certain past omissions and failures that can be continued only with serious consequences, and they represent the best remedy we can find for those inadequacies. This is especially true of the area centers, it seems to me.

When I refer to area studies in the same context as various other interdisciplinary centers, I should mention that, from the librarian's point of view, the area centers differ in one major respect. The other institutes, in their endeavor to focus various specializations on central problems, call on the library for resources that it has already accumulated in subject fields with which it is familiar. Or, if new scientific subjects are involved, no wealth of retrospective publication exists, and the library can keep up with the limited volume of current publication. The area programs, however, have a new orientation, demanding not only a high rate of current acquisition but significant retro-

---

*© 1965 The University of Chicago.

spective resources in which the major libraries of the country have always been deficient. Consequently, they impose greater burdens upon the library. For instance, on my campus we are likely to establish, in the near future, both an institute for human growth and development and a center for African studies. The former will demand few publications in the natural and social sciences that are not already available or that we would not wish to acquire for other reasons. Eventually, the members of this institute may press for special-service arrangements, such as a branch library with a duplicative collection, but neither the publications they will need nor the library specialization required to serve them is in any way extraordinary. The African center, on the other hand, will need publications in which the library and the university have had little or no previous interest. It will require the library staff to collect library materials in countries where they have no experience or where there is no satisfactory book-procurement source, to deal with languages in which they lack expertise, and to feel remorse because they are "letting down" scholars who came to the university stoically determined to publish or perish only to discover that the library is inadequate for the former alternative yet not quite bad enough to let them resign themselves to the latter.

COLLECTION-BUILDING

To get down to specific difficulties, let us first consider the general problem of collection-building, of acquisitions to support our area-studies programs. I have no estimate of the total number of publications produced in the areas of the world in question since the inception of printing. Nor do I know what percentage of these publications are now available in American libraries, nor how this percentage compares with the ratio of European publications available here to total publications produced in Europe since Gutenberg. Obviously, however, we have far to go before our holdings, say, of Chinese, or Japanese, or even Slavic publications are comparable to our western European collections. Obviously, also, we are not going to catch up quickly no matter how extravagant a mass-acquisitions program we may undertake. There simply is too much that is out of print. In too few countries do we find the eager and efficient bookdealers, such as have always existed in Europe, whose zeal for profit has made them a major factor in the systematic development of American research library collections. Two few collections are available (or known to be available) to permit rapid growth by large bloc purchases. Finally, too few librarians are available who are really equipped to take advantage of the sources of supply that do exist.

Given enough money and enough time, our libraries might do a reasonably good job of acquiring retrospective materials. They might gradually overcome the difficulties of an inefficient book trade, of language, and of lack of information needed to expedite selection and ordering. But it is impossible to do this rapidly and, of course, the premises of enough time and enough money are unrealistic. Part of our sense of urgency and frustration may derive from the realization that we cannot begin to do the necessary with respect to current publications from Asia, eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Latin American, let alone try to fill the lacunae in our retrospective collections. According to UNESCO's statistics for 1961, there were 375,000 books and pamphlets published throughout the world in that year.[1] Only 41 percent of these appeared in the countries of North America, Europe, and Oceania not involved in our area-studies programs. The balance, 59 percent, was published in the countries that are the subject of area studies. Recently I surveyed the libraries of the 12 largest universities engaged in extensive area-studies programs and discovered that in the year 1962–63 these 12 libraries had spent $859,000 for the purchase and binding of books and periodicals published in the countries of the Near and Far East, south and southeast Asia, and Eastern Europe. This sum represents 9.25 percent of their total expenditure of $9,288,000 for books, periodicals, and binding in that year. Personnel expenditures of these 12 libraries in 1962–63 relative to their area-studies programs amounted to $1,056,000, or 6.1 percent of their total salary and wage expenditure of $17,280,000. This discrepancy between our expenditures for the publications of the area-study countries, and the service thereof, and for those of the so-called Western World is not quite so extreme as these raw figures seem to indicate. A considerable percentage of our library expenditure serves the undergraduate program and the vast field of the basic and applied sciences, which are quite outside the area-studies complex. Nevertheless, it is safe to assume that our expenditures for the acquisition and cataloging of American and Western European publications would seem to be greatly out of proportion to our expenditures for the publications of the rest of the world. It is probably irrevelant that the ratio of our expenditures for area-studies materials is higher than the percentage of teaching faculty engaged in the area-studies programs and, I would guess, higher than any other ratio of expenditure reflecting the degree of university engagement in area studies relative to total university activity. It *should* be higher if we really believe that a significant research program in the social sciences and humanities cannot be carried on without extensive library collections. The fact is that we have no adequate standards to indicate whether the library is doing well or poorly other than the satisfaction of the faculty engaged in area studies; and their attitude generally seems to be, "You are giving us too little and too late."

The corrective seems to be hurried and hasty acquisitions programs. One university after another is investing more and more in Russian, Japanese, and Chinese publications, selected not to meet specific needs or research interests of the faculty but in terms of basic collection-building. Unfortunately, there are usually no very clear guidelines for the basic collection, its limits, extent, depth, specific inclusions, or exclusions. Often, faculty members interested in developing vernacular library resources from a specific Asiatic or Near Eastern or East European country set about it by trying to get a large sum of money appropriated and then spend hurriedly. Too often one feels that quantity is important rather than quality of materials. I state the case extremely, but to some extent this atmosphere of rush to acquire is present in every university library. The waste involved seems unavoidable given the pressure to do within a few years the collection-building for these Asiatic, African, and East European areas of the world that we spent generations accomplishing for western Europe.

---

[1] Statistical Office of the United Nations, *Statistical Yearbook, 1961* (New York: UNESCO, 1962), p. 634.

ORGANIZATION

The manner in which university libraries organize themselves to cope with and give service on publications from South and southeast Asia, the Near and Far East, and the Slavic countries also reflects the sense of urgency (or even of emergency) and the element of scarcity to which I refer. The library program sometimes is begun before there is anyone on the staff who can read the language or languages of the area involved. And there may be a long interval during which the library lacks personnel competent merely to sort and arrange the publications as they arrive. The staff engaged initially (frequently only one person) is charged with responsibility for selection, acquisition, cataloging, and reference—the last only if students and faculty can find his desk in either the cataloging or acquisitions departments. When additional professional staff can be provided, the functions of book selection and cataloging may be separated, and eventually a staff specialized in reference work may be employed. By this time, pressure for a separate reading room or even a discrete collection has mounted and a branch library frequently comes into being. Thus, we have a library illustration of the rule that ontogeny repeats phylogeny. The library unit repeats the development history of the library as a whole and of entire library systems. The area-center libraries in the various universities are in various stages of organic development at present, from the single employee in the catalog department who serves as general factotum and represents the single multipurpose cell in my zoölogical metaphor, to the full branch library with its own acquisitions, cataloging, reference, custodial, and administrative staff, or the complex organism in which the cells are highly specialized in function.

There is also considerable variation in policy with respect to separately maintained collections. At some libraries, publications from the Middle East, say, and the Western-language publications about that area have been brought together. At others, the vernacular publications have been assembled in one place, but the Western-language material is shelved as classified throughout the stacks. At still other libraries, both vernacular and Western-language publications are scattered throughout the classified collections. Nor is there a consensus or even a strong majority view as to whether the catalog cards for the collection should be kept separately or interspersed in the library's public catalog. Practice varies according to decisions made, often, on the basis of inclination or mild preference, not necessarily on the basis of evidence or even firm conviction.

The rationale for treating the vernacular Middle Eastern or Slavic or Far Eastern publications differently from the way our forerunners did the vernacular publications of Sweden or Greece or Germany is obvious. The library was once staffed by people who could read the title pages and prefaces of books in Swedish, Greek, or German, and it was assumed that a considerable number of students and faculty would be able to use them. Now we know that only a small, special group of faculty and students can read the Asian non-Roman alphabet publications, and only a very few of the library staff are competent to deal with them. Our tendency to shelve them separately and file the catalog cards for them in separate catalogs will become troublesome when our acquisitions from the Near and Far East, from South and southeast Asia, and from eastern Europe begin to rival in extent our intake of American and western European books. As the special vernacular collections grow, we shall find ourselves with increasingly great holdings, separated from related books in Western languages for reasons no longer valid, and controlled by multiple catalogs the reason for which is forgotten. I assume, of course, that the percentage of library users and faculty who know Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Arabic, Persian, Hindi, etc., will increase steadily as a consequence of the continuous success of the area-studies programs.

There is no gainsaying the relative convenience of branch-library collections and services for limited, easily defined collections of publications that serve special groups on a campus. It is also true that the justification for the establishment of one branch library is equally valid for almost any other and that most of the contrary arguments apply in every case. Whether the proliferation of branch libraries on a university campus is an indication of failure of the central or general library to give adequate service, the fact is that the trend toward branch libraries eventually becomes financially unsupportable; it scatters the collection distressingly at a time when the disciplines are merging and overlapping; it leads to a high degree of duplication of books and services, not on the basis of real need but to satisfy assumptions regarding convenience. In the long run the libraries that have not classified their non-Roman alphabet collections in such fashion as to permit their inter-shelving with the other books, or whose catalog cards cannot be interfiled with the rest of the catalog, will regret it. The libraries that establish branches for spurious reasons (and they have been established, on occasion, merely to create a management position high enough to attract a desirable candidate) are bound to find that the consequence is administrative angina.

PERSONNEL

The problem of personnel for library work in support of the area-studies programs is also intensified by the urgency and scarcity factors, but here the question of competition plays an equally baneful part. As a preface to any discussion of this question, it might be well to mention one personnel problem that might be called "paralibrary." It occurs only where the library director has a relatively free hand in determining his priorities for expenditure. I refer to pressure on the library to take a hand in retaining prized faculty.

It is not news that professors who have achieved eminence in the area-studies field and who have reached positions of influence in the right circles are in short supply and, consequently, are the recipients of rather frequent offers from other institutions. The lyrics of the academic siren song directed at such people these days treat of more than salary improvement or fringe benefits; they frequently offer the enchanting promise of better library resources and facilities than the professor being wooed has succeeded in "promoting" at his own university. In such cases the library director may find to his dismay that he has to interrupt his catatonic contemplation of the cataloging arrearage or his intricate planning to raise his customer services to the level achieved by his neighborhood grocer a generation ago Suddenly he finds that he is a key figure in the effort to keep the local stars in the local theater. If he succeeds he will have made budget, space, and personnel commitments that may impair his relationships with the great majority of faculty who have not the slightest interest in area studies and, indeed, regard them with suspicion. If he fails and more than one or two prized professors leave because the librarian was "negative in attitude" toward their research needs or those of their graduate students, the librarian may suddenly find when he smiles at certain deans, departmental chairmen, or vice presidents, they no longer smile back. Some years ago, Henry Wriston defined the most essential attribute of a university librarian as the ability to make a professor think you are saying "yes" when you are really saying "no."

Of course this same dilemma confronts the librarian with respect to other subject fields, but in the others the problem is of lesser magnitude. If the university library has done its work well over the generations, it is certain to have extensive and catholic collections. The scholar is usually a specialist, and even if there is a woeful deficiency of publications in his narrow specialty, he usually realizes that it is impossible to correct that deficiency very rapidly. Satisfying him may cause some budget adjustments but minor ones only. The professor who wants an increase in his departmental allotment to pay for more publications in some abstruse branch of mathematics or in classical numismatics, or French history of the Napoleonic era, is almost diffident compared with his brother who wishes to know, as he delicately threatens to take the bait cast in his direction by another university, if the local library will spend so and so many dollars within such and such a time in acquiring vernacular publications from the area with which he is concerned.

I would not have it seem that I regard as objectionable the dynamic approach to library collection-building by the area-studies groups. On the contrary, without such pressures and without their assistance our university libraries might be satisfied indefinitely with truly inadequate informational resources regarding two-thirds of the world and its peoples. In the long run, of course, the stimulus that the area-study groups provide to library collection-building will prove to be most salutary. But this stimulus and response occur, unfortunately, in a context of general and serious library inadequacies. Even when the university library's budget is increased to accommodate improvements in library services to area studies, it is hard to avoid the suspicion that the new program is merely an arbitrary rearrangement of priorities which leaves the library even further behind in its other work, the suspicion that yea-saying with respect to the Asia library only means harsher nay-saying with respect to the medical library, for example, or to the engineering library.

SPECIAL SKILLS

But this is a bypath and we cannot afford to stray along it further. Let us move from our digression to the question of specialized personnel in the library to serve the area-studies programs. It is a basic premise of library organization that at every step the library's activities are based on subject specialization or functional expertise. In cataloging, for example, or in dealing with special-form materials such as maps, *government* publications, et cetera, the library depends on its own staff's specialization. With regard to acquisition, it is essentially dependent on the specialization of the faculty. This it supplements, in varying degrees, with expertise on the part of its staff members. Lately there has been a growing tendency to provide more and more expertise for the acquisitions program within the library itself (Indiana and UCLA are examples) and to depend less and less on faculty assistance, but this still is not typical in American university libraries. Hitherto, also, extensive or intensive language proficiency was not of major concern. The rare-book librarian knew Latin and Greek, and a sufficient number of staff members had acquired enough proficiency in the languages of Western Europe so that no serious problems were encountered in the library's routine operations.

The expertise needed in the library to support the area-studies programs, however, is simply not available. (After all, it was to correct the sort of inadequacies with which the library must contend in dealing with the publications of the less familiar areas of the world that area-study programs were instituted.) Nor can the library depend on the faculty for assistance to any significant extent. The people who comprise the membership of an area-studies center are invariably based in the traditional departments. The economist member of the Far Eastern center may be well informed on the economics of Japan or China, let us say; the historian who is a member of the Middle East study center may be a historian of Islam; the geographer who combines his talents with those of other professors in the South Asian study center will undoubtedly be expert in the geography of that area. There is no one, however, in those groups who is competent to select current and retrospective publications in broad subject fields produced within the entire area with which he is concerned. To be candid, if one excludes the faculty members whose specialization is the language and literature of a specific country within an area, it is unusual to find a scholar interested in the Middle East or in Indian or the Far East or southeast Asia who is really proficient in the languages of the publications from those parts of the world. And with respect to India and southeast Asia, the language problem is almost insuperable. One need only consider that at one of the major university libraries in India, the native-born library staff members find it necessary to converse in Indian English in order to transact their daily business, nor are all the languages of India represented in the competences of that library staff. The American professor concerned with the history of southeast Asia cannot be expected to cope with the intricacies of Bahasa Indonesia, Burmese, and Thai. With respect to Arabic, Russian and the other Slavic languages, Japanese and Chinese, we fare better, but even in the Middle East, Turkish is poorly represented, as is Persian. The political scientist specializing in German political history and current affairs is often glad to do the book selection in his field. He may even insist on doing it rather than leaving it to librarians. His colleague in the political-science department whose field is South Asia or southeast Asia is more inclined to leave book selection to the library or even to require that it be done there; but this sort of expertise is simply not available for employment in our libraries.

Each of us with collections to support area studies try to guard our personnel who have special skills and special knowledge. We compete with each other scandalously for such people, and we import them from the remote areas of the world. We expect them to do the impossible. If we are fortunate enough to engage the services of an *émigré* Ukranian who knows something of book and journal production in Russia and is knowledgeable about Russian affairs we may thrust upon him the responsibility for book selection not only in Russia but in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The faculty in our area-studies centers press in varying degree for the employment of an expert in book selection whom they can regard as a peer. When the library does engage someone adequately qualified to allay the trepidation of the faculty regarding the quality of collection-building in their areas of interest, he is apt to be lured away by offers from other institutions to serve in an instructional capacity. This has happened at my institution three times within the last 3 years and we have had to fend off two other such attempts during the same period. Nor is it possible for the library to compete successfully with the instructional departments for the same people. The salary schedules for librarians and teaching faculty are not on a par nor are the fringe benefits accorded professors and librarians comparable. The attempt to find a solution in joint appointments, half-time in the library and half-time in an instructional department some of whose members are concerned with an area-studies program, usually proves to be administratively troublesome and is resolved eventually by the transfer of the shared staff member to a full-time teaching and research assignment.

SPREAD OF AREA-STUDIES CENTERS

Obviously, I have avoided all discussion of the particular problems of acquisitions, cataloging, and reference service relative to the publications of the various areas and have limited myself to generalizations that cannot be proved or disproved. If I have seemed ambivalent in my attitude, critical about that which I claim I admire, it is because I regard my situation as that of a patient suffering from a chronic ailment who willingly submits to therapy that has highly unpleasant side effects because he has no alternative. What, if anything, can we do about these side effects or problems caused by urgency, scarcity, competition, and poverty?

First, I should like to consider the question of the proliferation of area-studies centers and the possibility that we should not try to have so many. Not every university needs to embrace Chinese studies and Near Eastern and Slavic studies and South Asian studies, it is sometimes argued. Why not divide up the fields; reduce the competition for teachers, librarians, books, and foundation support? The tacit assumption underlying this suggestion must be that a few strong centers will be adequate to satisfy the country's need for experts. This is not defensible, I am convinced. Until the day when studies relative to the various eastern areas of the world are as commonplace at our universities as research relative to Europe and America, we probably should encourage every university that can possibly do so to undertake a focusing of talent on the various little-known areas of the world, not only to produce research scholars that will help us with the problems of foreign affairs, with the maintenance of peace, with international trade, with world health problems, etc., but also to produce a great many more educators who will introduce an awareness of these areas of the world into the curricula of our schools and colleges. In short, the area-studies center seems to be the best arrangement we now can effect at this stage in the evolution of a one-world philosophy of education and research in the social sciences and humanities. As our best means of remedying decades of national educational neglect of most of the world, we should try to increase rather than limit the number of such centers.

Parallel with the notion that not every university needs a studies center for every area is the notion that even where there are such centers not every university needs an extensive and expensive library development to support them. It is assumed sometimes that a large, well-organized collection of Japanese publications at one institution can suffice to serve a program in Japanese studies at another university not too far away. This is the old and vain hope that solutions for the ills of poverty may be found in the magic of co-operation (cooperation by the poor with each other). Co-operation is an article of the librarian's faith but it is not always specific against our ailments. My library will gladly co-operate to make our Japanese collections available to research on other nearby campuses. When it was suggested recently to several professors planning a Japanese studies development at a sister institution in my State that they did not need to develop a large collection in Japanese because they can freely use ours, they did not try to conceal their amusement at our naïveté. And they were right. Much as universities talk of and even effect cooperative arrangements, they still are essentially competitive. Even Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler may cooperate in framing an all-industry policy on excise taxes or tariffs or in resolving other problems in which working together will help them all without giving anyone an advantage. But they compete fiercely for customers, for prestige, and for talent that will help them acquire more customers and prestige. Universities are no different in their competition for status and prestige, for faculty, and for students who may become distinguished and influential alumni. Once a university undertakes an area-studies program it has to become first-rate as quickly as possible. The idea that it can hope to attract distinguished faculty for that center with the promise of access to another university's library is naïve. Nor can the most successful form of library co-operation, inter-library loan, replace the benefit of having extensive collections at one's elbow. It can only supplement such collections and very peripherally at best.

SOME GUIDES FOR DEVELOPMENT

But how can the many new centers which will be (or should be) established within the next few years acquire the publications they will need? Obviously, they cannot build really important collections of retrospective publications quickly except by expensive processes such as microfilming or other reproduction. Nor should they try to develop these extensively in anticipation of need. It is brought to our attention from time to time that the future may be longer than the past. (Indeed if it is not, we need not worry about the past anyway.) The main emphasis should be on acquiring current publications, on building collections starting with our time, and moving forward. On this basis no new library will have adequate resources for historical research for quite a long time to come, but, to be realistic, I see no escape from this conclusion, no matter what we may try to do about it. Today a library is apt to take pride in a general vernaculad Japanese collection of 50,000 volumes, covering a wide range of subjects. To a Japanese it must seem ridiculous that such a collection can be considered adequate for serious programs of research in depth. Rather than try to accomplish the impossible, I would argue that we hope for the advent of cheap copies through high-reduction-ratio photographic processes to reproduce the retrospective publications in great number, meanwhile buying and reproducing what experience teaches us that we *really* need of the past, not what we anticipate may be needed some day.

For the current acquisitions program, we again have evidence that not cooperation but centralization is the key. The Public Law 480 program is the bright example of "how to succeed." When it comes to acquiring and cataloging publications from those areas of the Eastern world where the book trade is undeveloped, we have proved that the work is done best when one central agency does it for all. We have never before had such success in getting and organizing the publications of any countries of the non-Western World as we now enjoy in those where the Public Law 480 program is operative. Granting that counterpart funds are not available in all the countries of Asia and Eastern Europe, there is no question, in my mind, that mutual support of centralized acquisitions and cataloging of the publications of all the non-Western World is the only way in which all the larger universities will develop the vernacular collections certain to be demanded in the not-too-distant future. If we are to carry on an adequate program, I am quite convinced that additional Federal aid will be necessary.

Support for the library's part of the area-studies programs by the universities has always been highly inadequate, of course. In 1962–63 the 12 libraries I queried received almost 29 percent of all the funds they expended in support of area studies from the National Defense Education Act and the Ford Foundation. Even with this outside support our total effort is much too small, illustrating the maxim that provision for library support of any program follows long after need, just as wages follow prices. A most significant change in the library adaptation to area-studies programs would be accomplished if university administrators would simply refuse to sanction a teaching and research program without first determining what will be expected of the library, how much it will cost for books, salaries, administration, and space and then including the library's estimates in the budget package. But such advance budget planning with respect to library costs is rarely done at a university, and I suppose it is merely sentimental to hope that the crust of habit may be easier to break in the area-studies field than in any other. It has not proved to be, so far.

Finally, as regards the very difficult problem of recruitment and training of personnel for library work in the field, I should like to refer to and counsel stoical resignation rgarding one administrative problem other than the usual difficulties of scarcity, competition, and so forth. I refer to the fact that on numerous occasions we have to recruit specialists to work in our libraries in the area programs who are not license-holding members of the library profession, and frequently we have to make exceptions to our pay scale, or even our policy on fringe benefits, in order to recruit them. Every library administrator has misgivings about this but is forced to accept the morale problems and employee dissatisfaction that accompany his making such exceptions. I have no solution for this dilemma and console myself that the same sort of difficulty besets the dean who finds that he can no longer employ instructors in some fields but must offer a youngster fresh from graduate school, if he wishes to attract him, an assistant professorship with a salary equivalent to the average pay for associate professors. We can only join in hoping that such inequities will eventually help us raise the entire salary structure in university librarianship. (*The Library Quarterly*, October 1965.)

THE NEED FOR RESEARCH

University Responsibilities and International Development Research

by Ralph Smuckler

Mr. Smuckler is acting dean of international programs at Michigan State University. The following paper was prepared by him for an American Council on Education meeting at East Lansing, Mich., in 1965 on the subject of "University Goals and Responsibilities in Foreign Operations."

> One cannot emphasize too strongly the role that systematic study, analysis, and experimentation must play in the evolution of improved methods of development assistance. We have a lot to learn. Research should address itself not only to discovery of new knowledge, but to the devising, designing, and testing of new procedures and materials in technical cooperation, and to the analytical study—for purposes of improved decisionmaking—of development assistance activities and their consequences.

This statement by John Gardner in his recent report, *AID and the Universities*, ought to be taken seriously by both sides of the "partnership" he analyzed. Both the Agency for International Development and the university community have a research task ahead which requires imagination, energy and sustained attention. We do, indeed, have "a lot to learn" about the substance and processes of change and development with which we are so concerned.

In the past we have had to plunge into development tasks on a trial-and-error basis. It is not to our credit that we are still frequently doing so. Without considering the research gaps themselves, even the experience of technical assistance personnel has not been well recorded; and where it has appeared in the literature, it frequently is not read or sufficiently studied by the inexperienced. We have all seen situations abroad when a change in personnel within AID or a contract team has meant starting almost from the beginning. The hard gained knowledge of one overseas generation is vastly diluted in the changeover to another. It is only partial consolation to realize that the lessons of experience are now becoming better recorded and transmitted than 10 years ago, for we still have along way to go.

Systematic research in fields and on problems related to technical assistance has expanded over the past 10 years, but is still very inadequate. As John Gardner put it:

> The most important single fact about development research today is that there isn't enough of it. If it were increased by a factor of 10 it would be a more appropriate response to the challenge of development.[1]

Recent AID movements in support of research on development processes are encouraging. The Agency's creation of a research division and program is a major beginning step; and the inclusion of a research clause in the 1965 revision of the standard contract acknowledges the potential reasearch contribution of contracting universities.

---

[1] John W. Gardner, *AID and the Universities* (New York: "Education and World Affairs," 1964) pp. 18–20.

The response of the university community should be enthusiastically supportive. To state the case even more strongly, universities and university people must now exercise initiative and imagination in expanding fundamental and usable knowledge in the development field.

What are some of the researchable questions for which we should now seek answers? What are the priorities? What are some of the avenues now open to research-minded scholars? What is now being done? What problems do we face? These are some of the queries with which this paper is concerned. It cannot present answers in a definitive or final sense, for such on the part of any one person would be presumptuous; but perhaps the systematic presentation of part of some of the answers will stimulate thought and provoke useful discussion.

RESEARCH NEEDS

We need to know vastly more about many subjects which relate closely to development. Our many and diverse needs can be grouped in a number of categories:

1. Studies of technical assistance administration and programing;
2. Research to facilitate development programing and planning;
3. Research on processes of change and development;
4. Research leading to technological, scientific, and other innovations applicable to problems of developing areas.

These are not mutually exclusive categories. In that respect they parallel development problems, themselves, for most seasoned observers agree the processes and problems of development are not clear cut, neat, or easily separated one from another.

In examining research needs, we should recognize that although much must still be uncovered, some scholars have already made a start. In some fields, much is already known and written, and because of the limits of existing methodology, little of substance can be added through further investigation until we have found new ways of obtaining data. In some fields, highly specialized work must be done on narrowly defined, but crucial matters. In short, though much must still be learned we do not start from the very beginning. In conducting aid programs and in planning research, it would be as foolish to ignore knowledge which we already have at our disposal, as it would be to restrict all action until research has run its full course and found "all" of the answers.

No one discipline has a monopoly on research related to development. We tend to go through vogues during which we eagerly turn to the economists, or anthropologists or natural scientists to discover the "truths." So far at least no one of these disciplines has justified our overblown expectations, although each is contributing significantly. Each of many fields and approaches will continue to be important in research on development. Furthermore, there are many who maintain that an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approach is needed, since the very nature of the problems is too complex for any one alone to explain satisfactorily.

Not all of the problems we face are researchable in a systematic and sound manner. Many of the questions we seek to answer are nonresearchable for one reason or another. Furthermore, many of the questions of significance must be answered through exercise of judgment based on definition of values and clarification of goals. On these questions, research can be of help, but the answers must come from other sources.

Category I: Research on technical assistance administration and programing

Although we have been engaged in international assistance programs for many years, there are still many unanswered questions about how best to administer, organize, staff, and evaluate these efforts. If this were not true of aid programing, it would be the great exception in the range of human endeavor. However, clarifying studies and research in this instance are even more important than in others. The great importance of the program and its senstive and vulnerable nature demand that we constantly improve its operation, and research studies can contribute some of the answers.

Included in this first category are research undertakings which deal with questions of administration and operation of technical assistance and aid projects and programs, university efforts included. We now have available a number of studies which help to clarify the important questions and provide some of the answers on matters of suitability of personnel, evaluation of project success, and suitability of various ways of administering technical assistance and aid. We must continue to study these and other important matters.

Consider some of the studies which deal with personnel working cross-culturally. In the late fifties, a major systematic study of overseas American personnel was conducted by the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University. The object of the study was to "reach for suggestive answers to four main questions about Americans abroad":

> What elements in the education and experience of an American are most relevant to his effective performance on an overseas assignment? (Or, in the question's simplest form: What is so different about living and working abroad?)
>
> To what extent are these elements central to the education and training processes to which present and prospective overseas Americans are exposed?
>
> What is now being done to prepare American civilians for overseas service?
>
> What should the American educational system—and some of its financial sponsors in business, government, and private foundations—be doing in this field?[3]

Analysis of statistics, previous studies, and extensive interview responses yielded much useful information and pointed to five elements of effective overseas performance: technical skill, belief in mission, cultural emphathy, a sense for politics, and organization ability. It also proposed an agenda for action which all universities should study before embarking on training and educational programs for international service.

Studies of overseas personnel have included intensive examinations of narrow aspects of cross-cultural adjustment, broad reviews of predeparture training experience, and studies of the impact of overseas experience on domestic professional careers. In a 1963 study, Francis C. Byrnes takes a careful look at 34 former technical assistance specialists and through lengthy interviews analyzes their conceptions of their overseas role.[3] In studies soon to be published researchers at the University of Southern California, Pennsylvania State, the University of Massachusetts, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology have looked at overseas personnel experience from several directions. These studies were financed by the Ford Foundation in a coordinated attempt to learn more about career and professional development problems for personnel engaged in international development assignments.[4]

---

[3] Harlan Cleveland, Gerard Mangone, John C. Adams, *The Overseas Americans* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

There are also descriptions and analyses of individual agency training programs such as those of the Army, AID, universities, and the State Department. Clarence Thurber studied and compared a number of orientation, predeparture, and other training programs and found a wide range of experimentation among universities and government agencies.[5]

Writers and researchers have also been concerned with criteria for evaluation of individual performance, a difficult task at best. Hollis Peter and Edwin Henry, after reviewing a number of studies in this area, suggest a number of illustrative possibilities: supervisor's ratings, the individual's self-appraisal, host national evaluations, judgment of outside experts, longevity on the job, objective measures of results or productivity. They conclude that, "the problem of weighing and combining several criterion measures into one measure of job success as a whole is still far from solution." They go on to consider some of the variables which may predict success overseas: personal history, critical incidents, language-learning readiness, success in training, ability, and intelligence.[6]

One interesting approach to research on cross-cultural adjustment is suggested by Eugene Jacobson in an article on "sojourn research."[7] He divides the overseas experience of the individual into a series of nine phases and considers appropriate research for each. Throughout the sequence, three comparative research threads may be pursued: "comparative studies of personality, culture, and sojourn maturity." Research on cross-cultural adjustment, including "culture shock," has obvious relevance to problems of personnel effectiveness.

These are some of the serious studies and analyses of overseas personnel which are now in the literature. There are many more, and there are other studies in process; but there is still much to be learned in this one segment of important knowledge related to how we can operate more effectively abroad.

---

[3] Francis C. Byrnes, *Americans in Technical Assistance* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965).

[4] There have been many studies and analyses dealing with recruitment, selection, and evaluation of personnel for development activities including to mention a few: L. T. Kroeger & Associates, *Personnel for the Mutual Security Program*, Study No. 2, U.S. Senate, Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, 1957; Karl Mathieson and Edith Lord; *Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Recruitment, Screening and Selection for the Agency for International Development*, Mar. 19, 1962 (Mimeo); Mattram Torre, "Personality Adjustment in Overseas Service" in Cleveland and Mangone (eds.), *The Art of Overseasmanship* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1957).

[5] Clarence E. Thurber, "The Problem of Training Americans for Service Abroad in U.S. Government Technical Cooperation Programs," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1961.

[6] Hollis W. Peter and Edwin R. Henry, "Measuring Successful Performance Overseas," *International Development Review* III, October 1961, pp. 8–12.

[7] Eugene H. Jacobson, "Sojourn Research: A Definition of the Field," *The Journal of Social Issues*, July 1963, XIX, No. 3. The entire issue of the *Journal* is devoted to "Human Factors in Cross-Cultural Adjustment" and contains a number of useful articles and reports on research.

For some time, universities have been trying to estimate and evaluate the impact of technical assistance and exchange programs on the countries within which they are working overseas. Reciprocally, they seek to understand the impact of oversea programs on their own home campuses. In a study financed by the Carnegie Corp., Edward W. Weidner and associates at Michigan State University undertook a series of studies to measure these two-way effects. Just as the study by Harlan Cleveland and associates is "must" reading for those university people studying oversea personnel, the studies by Weidner and colleagues should be read by those concerned with the world role of universities.[8] Not that further research in these two areas is not needed; but both represent major efforts which add much and should be considered as basic to further examination.

The university approach to development problems is but one of many. Various other approaches which, perhaps, are more direct have been examined and still need further analysis. The National Planning Association project on technical cooperation in Latin America began in 1953 and resulted in a number of major studies and publications. These were financed by the Ford Foundation and provide an excellent beginning point for those concerned with the variety of approaches to technical cooperation in Latin America. One approach, that of the "*servicio*," is thoroughly considered in the study in this series by Philip Glick.[9]

Other studies analyze and evaluate the work of the Joint Commission for Rural Reconstruction in China as another way of administering development assistance in another part of the work.[10] Multinational efforts, such as the Colombo plan, and efforts by international agencies have also been studied. The Russian and Chinese aid programs have been described. And certainly the organization and administration of the U.S. aid program has been observed, studied, dissected, analyzed, criticized and praised in its total form and in subsections.

But in spite of all this we still seek through research to find better ways of assisting development, for many questions still go unanswered. We are still seeking to evaluate overseas development projects more sharply, more objectively, more intelligently.[11]

---

[8] Edward W. Weidner, *The World Role of Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962). This is the summary volume of the series; Edward W. Weidner and others, *The International Programs of American Universities* (East Lansing: The Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1958); Martin Bronfenbrenner, *Academic Encounter: The American University in Japan and Korea* (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1961); Henry Hart, *Campus India, An Appraisal of American College Programs in India* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1961); Richard N. Adams and Charles C. Cumberland, *United States University Cooperation in Latin America* (East Lansing: The Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1960); Walter Adams and John A. Garraty, *Is the World Our Campus?* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1960); Bruce L. Smith, *Indonesian-American Cooperation in Higher Education* (East Lansing: The Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1960).

[9] Philip M. Glick, "The Administration of Technical Assistance" (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957). Others in the series: Arthur T. Mosher, "Technical Cooperation in Latin America" and James G. Maddox, "Technical Assistance by Religious Agencies in Latin America."

[10] Annual reports of the Joint Commission for Rural Reconstruction are useful in reviewing its work over the years. See also: "A Decade of Rural Progress, 1948–58" (Taipei: Joint Commission for Rural Reconstruction, 1958) 68 pp.; A. F. Raper, "Rural Taiwan—Problem and Promise" (Taipei: Joint Commission for Rural Reconstruction, 1953) 296 pp.; E. S. Kirby, "Rural Progress in Taiwan" (Taipei: Joint Commission for Rural Reconstruction, 1960) 160 pp.

[11] A new study to evaluate university institution building efforts in agriculture is being carried out by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) with AID sponsorship. AID is also supporting a study of technical assistance administration in agriculture. This study is being done by the Maxwell School of Syracuse University.

Evaluation, though necessary, can be a very difficult task. Criteria are frequently ill defined and the methods of objectively and accurately measuring success are lacking or ill suited. Furthermore, too frequently, evaluation research is done too soon or too rapidly and lacks perspective over time. Clearly much needs to be done to clarify criteria and methods of evaluation. Poorly done evaluation studies can do more harm than good, especially if they focus on the spectacular and flamboyant.

Perhaps the most useful writing on this subject can be found in a UNESCO publication, "Measuring the Results of Development Projects" by Samuel P. Hayes, Jr.[12] Hayes suggests four steps to the complicated task of identifying and measuring changes resulting from a development project. First, it is necessary to describe the development project and specify its goals. Second, decide what data to use to indicate project results. Third, these data are to be compiled and collected—before, during, and after. Finally, analyze and interpret the findings which should be reviewed with interested groups. Hayes points out that, "Uncovering the results of individual projects is simpler and less costly (than analyzing whole programs) and can often be carried on by the persons directly involved in the project." [13]

If universities and others engaged in projects abroad would heed Hayes' suggestion, we would be amassing far more useful and accurate data with which to measure progress, and to evaluate project success or failure.

Category II: Research to facilities development programing and planning

In a sense, all research which tells us more about how to administer aid programs or adds to our understanding of development processes, also facilitates development programing and planning. But there are some studies to be made which essentially describe and/or analyze local conditions and which are directly applicable and necessary for intelligent programing of aid resources and planning of development. Without description, basic data compilation, and thoughtful analysis of relationships, planning would be wasted and resources would be poorly allocated.

A number of studies are now underway in Africa which illustrate this type of essential research. In spring 1964, AID requested a study and analysis of training opportunities available to Africans within their home countries and in third country locations. The study which covered a number of African countries also analyzed and took into account projections of manpower needs and educational development plans. The main purpose of the study from AID's standpoint was to enable it to plan and administer its participant training and related activities more prudently.[14]

Two studies now underway under AID auspices in Nigeria provide further illustrations. One is an assessment of educational development needs and plans in relation to manpower projections; the other is concerned with agricultural and rural development. The former is being done by a committee of education and world affairs; the latter, by an ad hoc consortium of universities working under AID contracts in the field of agriculture in Nigeria (Michigan State, Wisconsin, Kansas State, and Colorado State). Both are expected to yield information and insight which will facilitate wise use of aid program funds and energy.

---

[12] UNESCO, 1959. This "manual for the use of fieldworkers" was prepared as the first UNESCO monograph in the applied social sciences.

[13] Ibid., pp. 15–16.

[14] The study was undertaken by Education and World Affairs in cooperation with the African Liaison Committee of the American Council on Education. John Masland was study director.

There is an unending need for studies of this type. Included generally would be manpower studies, industry feasibility studies, crop surveys, administrative and social organization descriptions, surveys of school systems, cost analyses of many varieties, soil and other natural resource surveys and many others. In many cases, all that is needed is a pulling together and systematizing of existing data and studies. Universities can play an important role in this type of much needed research.

Category III: Research on development and change processes

What are the crucial processes through which change occurs in a given society? How can change be induced successfully in various cultures? Anthropologists, sociologists, political scientists, economists, and many others have been at work on answers to various components within these broad questions. The need for research in this fundamental area is as endless as change itself. We need to get more of our best social science researchers interested in the researchable questions relating to the processes of change and development.

For purposes of illustrating gains which are being made, consider several broad research efforts now underway. One major research effort is attempting to determine the importance of certain variables in the process of building new institutions abroad, a process in which many universities are now involved. An organization with headquarters at the University of Pittsburgh (cosponsored by researchers at Indiana University, Syracuse, and Michigan State) has started a number of studies in this direction. For this research, "institution building" has been defined as "the planning, structuring and guidance of new or reconstituted organizations which (*a*) embody changes in values, functions and/or technologies, (*b*) establish, foster and protect new normative relationship and action patterns, and (*c*) attain support and complimentarity in the environment." Examples of such institutions are development banks, planning agencies, and universities.

To guide the research in its early stages, a number of central concepts have been formulated. Among these are clusters of variables pertaining to the institution as a social system. The cluster of variables are: leadership, doctrine, program, resources, and internal structure. Within each of the clusters, a number of elements and properties have been identified which appear significant for the analysis of the institution building process. The analytical framework also includes the concept of institutional linkages, or points of interaction with the environment. These linkages are grouped into various classes.[15]

This system of institution building analysis is now being applied through research on university development in Ecuador, on a college of education in Nigeria, on an Institute of Public Administration in Thailand, and on a higher staff training academy in Pakistan. These studies will be comparable and over the years many such studies will contribute comparable data within these analytical categories. This represents a careful, systematic approach which sets forth an analytical framework which will be adjusted and modified as research indicates a need. Ultimately, research such as this could be of great value practically as well as theoretically. It could lead us to a more fundamental understanding of what we are engaged in and to more effective institution building efforts overseas.[16]

---

[15] See *Inter-University Research Program in Institution Building* and other explanatory materials available through the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh. Main support for the interuniversity program comes from a Ford Foundation grant. AID is also supporting part of the research.

Another important new study is concerned with accelerating the diffusion and adoption of agricultural technology under a wide range of social and economic conditions in developing countries. Knowing which communication channels and techniques are effective in different social environments and with different types of people should provide useful guidelines for action programs. The main study will be conducted in three countries: Brazil, Nigeria, and India.[17]

Any examples of social science research related to development processes would only be minimally illustrative. Within each field—anthropology, sociology, psychology, political science, and economics—there are many studies and groups of scholars concerned with research problems in this field. Within political science, the work of the Committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council is providing an analytical framework and a series of individual studies related to political development.[18] The Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration is another group of scholars concerned with the carrying out of development programs—the administration of development. From their efforts have come a large number of thoughtful papers, several studies, and a number of suggestive and potentially productive avenues for research on development administration.[19]

Much has been done by these social science researchers, but much more is needed. Many of the tasks of development can proceed only with a full knowledge and understanding of the behavior of people. It is not enough to know that a wheat crop could be doubled by using certain amounts of chemical fertilizer at specified intervals. We must also know the economic cost of the fertilizer, its comparative economic value as an innovation in terms of market value of the new product, and other factors. We must know how to make the administrative and communication system (public and/or private sector) work so that the information leading to adoption of the innovation can be in the right place at the right moment, and so that the crop can find its way to a good market. We have to know the behavior of the peasant, his willingness to accept change under various circumstances. We should know the social effects of increased family income from the larger wheat crop. And we must balance all of this within an expanded knowledge of political impact and governmental change. To know that the fertilizer—or irrigation, or some other innovation—will "work" is not enough. University researchers of the highest competence must be encouraged to find answers to these many other crucial questions.

---

[16] A bibliography recently circulated by the institution building research program contained several hundred relevant entries.

[17] The study will be directed by Prof. Everett Rogers in the Department of Communication and the International Communications Institute at Michigan State University. An AID contract supports the study.

[18] See G. Almond and J. Coleman (eds.), *The Politics of the Developing Areas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960); Robert E. Ward and Dankwart A. Rustow, *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964); Lucian W. Pye (ed.), *Communications and Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963); and J. LaPalombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963).

[19] See E. W. Weidner and A. Spitz, *Development Administration, An Annotated Bibliography* (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1963); also various publications of the CAG as listed in the *C.A.G. Newsletter*, vol. III, No. II, February 1965. The CAG is headquartered at the University of Indiana and is led by Prof. Fred Riggs.

Category IV: Research leading to technical and scientific innovation

Within this fourth category we can include the vital contributions made by scientists and those in applied scientific fields. It is frequently suggested that we know enough already to satisfy needs of developing areas but must concentrate now on finding ways to extend knowledge to the many. But one can also point to signs that this is only partially true.

Do we know enough about rice, the main crop which sustains so many millions in Asia? What about various parasites including those carried by the tsetse fly which make it so difficult to raise livestock in parts of Africa? There is still scientific work to be done on birth control mechanisms, on new uses for old crops, on water control and use, on desalinization, on tropical diseases, on nutritional problems, on fertilizers, on the use of solar energy, and on many other matters which should continue to challenge scientists for many generations.

AID is now supporting a number of studies in the field of agriculture which illustrate the needs. Basic research on the nutritional status of soils in Latin America is now underway by scientists at North Carolina State. Latin America must double agricultural output in the next 20 years in order to increase per capita food supply. This research project will be directed toward a major factor related to expanded crop productivity.

Another study is directed toward development and use of improved varieties of major cereal crops in Africa. A third research endeavor deals with tsetse fly control or eradication through use of the sterility method. Biological methods used successfully against the screw worm in the United States are being used experimentally against the tsetse fly in this project headquartered in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia.

Here are titles of some of the agricultural science research projects suggested by AID staff members and others: Desalinization and Salt Control Research on Agricultural Soils of Arid Regions; Improvement of Vegetables in Southeast Asia; Chemisterilantsf or Noxious Wild Birds; Research on the Eradication of Snails Which Are Carriers of Schistosomiasis (bilharzia).[30]

These examples are drawn from agriculture, but the needs are much broader. The AID research program also suggests studies in public health, engineering and other technical and scientific fields. For example:

ADAPTATION AND INNOVATION ENGINEERING IN INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

The adaptation of imported, and the upgrading of local, technology in the industrial system of developing countries is a particularly visible problem in the general process of modernization. The research envisaged would consist of selected engineering studies, both theoretical and experimental, on questions of the following types: (1) the feasibility and the suitability of specific inventions or adaptations of existing technology; (2) engineering identification of industrial production problems in developing economies which present technological challenges; (3) examination of certain promising areas of modern technology from the viewpoint of inventive adaptation to conditions abroad.[21]

---

[30] See *AID Research Program in Agriculture and Rural Development, Fiscal Year 1962–67*, Agency for International Development, January 1965.

The suggestions of AID are by no means definitive or all inclusive. The boundaries of research needs are as broad as science itself. Who can predict the productive research directions which will be followed as we attract our best research minds into these efforts?

SEVERAL APPROACHES TO RESEARCH BY THE UNIVERSITIES

The assault on these various categories of research tasks must be made along several routes simultaneously. The need is too great to permit anything less. We must find ways to accelerate the growth of knowledge and its effective application to the problems of developing areas.

One route—support of individual scholars—is traditional, well tested, and known to be useful. We must continue to encourage the individual scholar and groups of researchers who have contributed so much through research in the past. The AID research program must expand its support of worthwhile scholarship on problems of development. Other agencies of the Government, private foundations and universities themselves are also potential sources of expanded support for scientific and other studies of immediate and long-range significance in the international field.

Beyond this, however, the AID-university contract system itself could be put to even greater effectiveness in research if universities would expand initiative in this direction.

One of our contributions should be the stimulation of research programs within each of the new institutions we are helping to develop overseas. If American universities are to be true to their own tradition, they must insist that the research component be incorporated as a part of the normal, healthy growth of educational institutions in the emerging nations. A strong interest and ability in research on the part of local personnel should be one criterion for deciding whether or not a successful institution building effort has been realized.

It is true that this research emphasis would be, in some countries, contrary to prior educational tradition; but that should not deter us. By helping to find ways to install strong research programs conducted by indigenous personnel we would be taking a major step toward eventually finding the answers we need. Over the years, we would be much farther ahead.

Furthermore, we would be encouraging a process which could contribute greatly to the quality of the overall educational product of the new institution. Publications derived from studies of matters close to home by local professors—studies, case studies, data compilations and analyses, descriptions—would provide much-needed classroom materials rooted in the reality of the local society. Too often and for too long, students in Africa study the "flora and fauna" of England or France, and study public or business administration through cases drawn from U.S. experience and tied to American institutions.

---

[21] *Contract Program in Research and Analysis* (Washington: Agency for International Development, revised Apr. 7, 1964) p. 9.

Finally, building strong indigenous research programs would provide productive research bases for United States and other scholars dedicated to examining topics appropriate to the developing areas. Collaborative research would follow, and the quality and relevance of research output by both the Western and the non-Western research partner would be enhanced.

Another route to the expansion of knowledge is to add a research component—perhaps even a research obligation—to many university technical assistance contracts. This addition would have a number of outcomes. First, it would broaden and expand overall research activity and product. Second, it would help to assure that research were done on relevant subjects, i.e., related to the very processes and complexities of development which the university and others are addressing. It might also provide an immediate application of new knowledge, since the research product would be kept close to the potential user. Third, it would help attract high-quality talent into the university contract program generally.

It is the obligation of universities to insist that the research component in new contracts be carefully—and usually affirmatively—considered. Once included in the contract, the university must insist that the research effort keeps pace with the quality and perseverance of other parts of the specific overseas contract project. Qualified faculty must design and carry out the research; publication of findings must not lag.

Adding a general research component to university technical assistance contracts would not replace the need to establish and support specific additional research projects which would operate independent of institution building efforts. Some studies could best proceed independently. Furthermore, some are best pursued in several countries and thus could not be encompassed within a single technical assistance contract.

In some instances, because of the breadth of complexity of the research project, AID or other sponsors should be encouraged to seek multiuniversity groups or consortia to undertake the research. An example of this approach is the four-university group mentioned above which is studying agricultural planning and potential in Nigeria. In that particular case, all four institutions are also active in agricultural technical assistance work in that country; and, therefore, there were clear advantages to use their research abilities as well.

The new standard contract recognizes the possibility of making use of graduate students in university projects. Universities ought to see that they are well integrated into the research plans under the contract. Their contribution can be significant. And over the long run, their involvement in serious, systematic overseas research will yield an expanded "next generation" of researchers able and eager to build the knowledge base essential to development programs.

Furthermore, by including a resonable graduate student component in oversea project work, universities can more easily interest more capable faculty members in oversea assignment. The problem of disruption in graduate programs could be partially solved. The professor who takes with him several advanced graduate students is in a position to multiply the impact of his stay abroad and to contribute in directions not previously possible.

What is needed is university initiative and imaginative leadership. The endorsement of the Gardner report by AID and the expansion of the contract provisions to recognize clearly the possibility of research and the use of graduate students opens the door. But it remains for the universities to make full use of these opportunities and thus contribute even more positively to development abroad. One step universities should seriously consider is suggested by John Gardner in his report.

> Universities have always seen it as one of their primary responsibilities to create the conditions and circumstances in which their scholars can do creative work. Thus they build and maintain multimillion dollar research libraries, nuclear accelerators, and astronomical observatories. If they face up to their comparable responsibilities in the field of development, they might create important development research centers on their own campuses and research stations overseas.[illegible]

RESEARCH PROBLEMS

Endeavors within the broad categories of research suggested above have been going on long enough to permit us to identify some of the types of problems which we cannot ignore as we expand our efforts. Although the difficulties are great they are not prohibitive. They must be taken into account by the university community and treated as carefully as possible in designing and carrying out research on development.

Certain problems occur because of the nature of the setting itself; others, because of the complex nature of the questions we are trying to answer. Other problems can be traced to the understandable impatience, the overeagerness of those in development activities.

Nature of setting.—Consider the fact that many of the countries within which research must take place are governed by precarious regimes, are thirsting to realize full equality and rapid social and economic growth, sensitive to outside (or even internal) criticism, are frequently overloaded with studies and analyses of questionable use, and undermanned with talent able to carry through development schemes. This type of setting generates research problems.

Immediately, the researcher is faced with the need to exercise extra discretion in using data and publishing conclusions. One cannot assume that a carefully designed and well-executed study will yield an immediately publishable manuscript, since publication may result in denying access to future researchers (and others) or in regressive measures by the Government in power. This is particularly true in social science studies.

In some countries there is now clear evidence that research which calls for interviewing top officials ought to be limited; not because of sensitivity, but just because too often the process is operating contrary to productivity and efficiency of the government. The same handful of officials are being interviewed too often. The benefits of the research product are not balancing the loss of time and nuisance to decisionmakers. Furthermore, the problem is magnified when the interviewing is by outsiders, some of whom have not explored alternative sources of information or, due to scanty experience or prior study, have not pinpointed the type of questions needed. Everybody wants to talk to the harassed minister of education; few will settle for data

---

[illegible] John W. Gardner, *AID and the Universities* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964) p. 20.

or answers coming from his subordinates, sufficient as such may be in some cases.

Even when top officials are not involved, outside researchers are wearing out the "welcome mat" in some countries. This has been noticeable in certain African countries. In a sense, the foreign scholar becomes a "carpet bag" researcher unless he has well-established relationships and shares his research plans, data, and conclusions with interested local scholars.

There are many operating problems arising out of the nature of the setting: the general inadequacy or lack of important statistical data, the shortage of research assistants and trained interviewers, communications and transportation difficulties, shortage and maintenance problems related to electrical and laboratory equipment. All of these argue for extreme care in designing, scheduling, and controlling reserach projects. They also suggest the increasing need for close collaborative efforts with local scholars and local research organizations.

Nature of research subjects.—Some of the research problems which need attention are manageable without requiring advance in methodology. Some agricultural research, certain health studies and others in the natural sciences can be transferred, with some adaptation, to the less-developed countries. The methods are fairly clear and probably would yield success over time in Africa or India as they have in Iowa or France.

However, many crucial questions concerning change processes are not yet researchable even in the more advanced countries. Techniques of data collection and analysis have not yet caught up with the questions raised. The number of variables in some seemingly simple behavioral research problem prohibits conclusive research products even in the advanced countries. In short, limitations on methodology set limits to what we can do in researching many vital problems in this field. The complex nature of the problems we face abroad will require expansion of our research sophistication if we are to find the answers we need.

If we are to proceed we must have far more talented researchers taking a direct interest in research problems abroad. The expansion of research opportunities in more comfortable and established settings at home makes it difficult to attract the quality of talent we need in studies abroad. Although the overseas challenge is great, there are also many interesting research possibilities at home.

Furthermore, research interest and ability is in short supply within underdeveloped countries. Since the research problems are difficult, highly qualified researchers are needed; and they will not be easy to produce. A shortage will be with us for some time.

The only way we will make rapid progress in overcoming these difficulties is to expand the total effort and be sure that we are not wasting resources. As suggested above, research tied to institution building efforts will help overcome personnel shortages, and also provide a ready market for the research findings.

Another possibility is to build up and sustain major research facilities abroad. The efforts of the foundations in establishing such major, sustained programs can serve as models. The relatively new Rice Research Institute in the Philippines and the planned Tropical Agriculture Institute in West Africa are good examples. These offer the advantages of continuity and sharpening of focus. They would also provide more attractive settings for U. S. and other researchers to pursue specialized and long-range investigations. Cooperative efforts by universities to exercise initiative along this line are overdue.

Overeagerness.—For good reasons, the leaders and people of the emerging countries want to attain the fruits of development quickly. Few are willing to think in terms of generations of gradual progress. Most seek sustained, rapid growth.

Although there is bound to be much frustration, it is logical that Americans and others assisting in development must also strive to move the process along quickly and to do whatever they can to satisfy these expectations. We must certainly attempt to bring expectations in line with reality, but if we are to be effective contributors we must help keep the pace as rapid as we can.

Within our own country there has been much short-term thinking as well. Our Congress has not been willing to consider the aid program as a long-range endeavor. And as a result, in spite of all informed advice to the contrary, we are frequently forced to stress immediate impact research programs and premature closing of institution building projects.

The difficulties arising are clear. Early impact studies abound. Emphasis on basic research lags; long-term studies are not often projected; inadequate evaluation studies are encouraged. Universities must be sure that their research energies and talent are not wasted on poor research, designed to meet inappropriate deadlines in spite of the complexity of the problems. While they must strive to move quickly, they must not assume that speed is always possible or wise.

Our tendency to be caught up in a whirl of time pressure also yields a projection of broad, surface level research on complex problems where careful analysis calls for piece-by-piece investigation. For example, we can't evaluate overall "success and failure" in personnel performance overseas until we have first looked carefully at many components. Nor can we study such broad subjects before criteria are spelled out and many other nonresearchable questions are answered.

SUMMARY

The need for expanded research related to development is abundantly clear. The need for broader initiative by universities and university faculty is great. Expansion of knowledge must accompany application and transmission of knowledge if we are to be true to our university traditions and if we are to be effective in what we are attempting to do overseas.

Research needs can be viewed in four major categories:

1. Studies of technical assistance administration and programing—including research on administration and operation of technical assistance and aid projects; oversea personnel matters; evaluation, etc.
2. Research to facilitate development programing and planning—including manpower studies, industry feasibility studies, surveys of school systems, soil, and natural resource surveys, various types of data compilations, etc.

3. Research on development and change processes—including social scientific studies of institution building, behavioral studies, economic analyses, etc.
4. Research leading to scientific or technical innovation—including studies involving agricultural sciences, public health and medical personnel, engineers and scientists, etc.

Within each category important research is in progress, but there is room for expansion and improvement. Much of the research requires sophisticated methodology and a thorough knowledge of what has been attempted to date. The research tasks are difficult and call for our best efforts, in many cases on a multi or interdisciplinary basis. Furthermore, not all problems of development call for research; some problems can only be solved by good judgment, weighing of values and clear statement of goals. While research cannot provide us with answers to all the questions, it can help with many.

In pursuing expanded development research we should try several approaches. First, the support of individual, capable scholars is traditional, productive and should be continued and expanded: Second, the AID technical assistance contract system should be put to greater effectiveness by incorporating a research dimension in most contract programs. This should include building research activity into the overseas institution as it develops. It should also include adding a research component or obligation into the university contract. This is permitted by the new standard contract as is inclusion of graduate students in the research or related aspects of the contract project. Universities should exercise full initiative to see that these important new possibilities are included regularly in program planning and contract negotiation.

There is no shortage of problems in carrying out research on development overseas. Some problems derive from the nature of the setting, others from the complex nature of the research subjects, and still others from the pressure for speed. None of these are insurmountable, but they do suggest need for extra care, careful strategy and design, close working relationships with local researchers, and a need for new major research centers abroad. (Paper, American Council on Education meeting, East Lansing, Mich., May 12–13, 1965.)

The Quality of Aid

by David E. Bell*

Mr. Bell, formerly Administrator of the Agency for International Development, became Vice President of the Ford Foundation in the summer of 1966.

It is my impression that the organizations which carry out aid programs do not have a distinguished record of building into those programs strong elements of research and evaluation. Certainly this is true of AID, the Agency I know best.

This is unfortunate on at least two counts. First, foreign assistance is a relatively new activity and plainly we have an enormous amount to learn about how to conduct it effectively. We have lost much valuable time and have failed to learn from much valuable experience, because we have not had adequate research and evaluation programs. Second, the process of foreign assistance is inherently dependent on research. It is often described as a method of transferring know-how, but this is plainly wrong; it is instead a process of developing know-how—a process of finding out what will work in Nigeria, not of transferring what has been found to work in Nebraska. If we understood our own business better, it might well be that the whole process of foreign aid would be seen as a research process, aimed at learning how to move a particular society, with its special and unique characteristics of history and culture and physical geography, toward specified objectives.

However that may be, there can be no doubt of the importance of incorporating far stronger programs of research and evaluation into our aid administration. We in the Agency for International Development have been trying to make some headway in this direction. For example: (*a*) For the last 3 years, we have organized special summer research projects on the economic aspects of development, drawing together faculty members and graduate students from a number of universities for a summer of research work that benefits them and greatly benefits us; (*b*) over the last 4 years, we have gradually built up a program of research grants, financing such varied activities as trying to increase production of high-protein grain legumes in Asia, and developing a new mathematics curriculum for elementary schools in Africa. In this we have had the guidance of a distinguished advisory committee of research scientists chaired by Dr. Walsh McDermott of Cornell University; (*c*) a year ago we persuaded Colonel George Lincoln, of the West Point social science faculty, to spend his sabbatical examining AID's systems of evaluation, and recommending improvements in them. Colonel Lincoln's report, based on extensive field work in Latin America, is a valuable guide that is now being applied throughout the Agency.

---

*Quoted by special permission from FOREIGN AFFAIRS, July 1966. Copyright by the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., New York.

In these ways and others, AID is taking steps to improve its own performance. We still have far to go, particularly in finding how we can build into every aspect of our work the spirit of research on development problems. We also have done far too little in a systematic way to help create research competence in the developing countries themselves. (*Foreign Affairs*, July 1966.)

Educational Development

*by R. Freeman Butts**

Mr. Butts is Associate Dean for International Studies at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Underlying all other means of improving our technical assistance programs is the need for continuing fundamental research in order to create a body of tested knowledge upon which to base the improvement of education so as to strengthen the economic, political, cultural, and national development of the peoples of the world. Such research should marshal the resources of scholarship in the social sciences and should probe deeply into the fundamental interrelationships of education and social change. It should synthesize what has already been learned about educational cooperation; it should utilize what is being learned by the social scientists about social change; and it should bring this knowledge to bear upon the problems of education and modern nationhood in the various parts of the world. The cooperation of scholars from different national and cultural backgrounds, especially those from countries that are themselves being studied, is as essential as the cooperation of scholars representing different academic disciplines.

For the most part, the results of the "educational" activities of our technical assistance programs, as broadly defined, have not been systematically studied or carefully evaluated; nor has enough been done to assess the specific activities more readily recognizable as "educational"; namely, explicit aid to school systems, teacher training institutions, and universities. Fifteen years of extensive but disparate international educational activity is awaiting anaylsis, interpretation, evaluation, and rationalization. Meanwhile, and often unrelated to our action-oriented programs, universities have accelerated their scholarly studies and fundamental research in international affairs and social change. These programs have been marked by a rapid accumulation of empirical knowledge and by new formulations of theory in the several social sciences.

Much of this scholarly work is being produced by university schools of international affairs and by regular academic departments in such fields as political science, international relations, economics, anthropology, sociology, history, psychology, foreign languages, and literature. In addition, special study of particular regions of the world goes on in the newly created "area institutes" * * * Also, study of a wide range of related problems has been undertaken at special centers devoted to international studies at MIT, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, and elsewhere.

I have been particularly impressed by the studies of the modernization process that have been coming from the Center for International

---

*From *American Education in International Development*, by R. Freeman Butts. © 1963 by R. Freeman Butts. Reprinted by permission of Harper & Row, publishers.

Studies at MIT where economists have been joined by political scientists, sociologists, anthropologists, and social psychologists to undertake fundamental studies of the processes of social change but with an eye cocked on important questions of national and international policy.[1]

The theories of the modernization process being developed in these studies and in other important works[2] are extremely interesting as they seek to formulate the stages of political and economic development through which societies pass as they move from traditional forms of organization and outlook through various stages of transition to modern forms of society and behavior. Even though the rigorous processes of inquiry characteristic of mathematical theory in the physical sciences may not be duplicated, the effort of the social scientists to clarify, categorize, classify, and predict is nonetheless exceedingly worthwhile. Especialy valuable is the effort to bring together into some coherent whole the empirical and descriptive studies as well as theroretical formulations from the fields of economies, political science, sociology, anthropology, and social psychology as they bear upon international development.

Again, these undertakings give far too little explicit attention to education, either in its broader or narrower sense, or to its dynamic role in international affairs, modernization, national planning, or economic and cultural development. Seldom are the results of social science research brought to bear upon educational policy, theory, or practice; seldom in turn is educational research used to illuminate the processes of social change.

I am happy to report that some significant gains are being made in this respect. With help from the Carnegie Corp., the Harvard Graduate School of Education has set up a new Center for Studies in Education and Development; the University of Chicago Comparative Education Center has launched a series of research projects on education and socioeconomic development in developing societies; the Institute of Advanced Projects of the East-West Center in Hawaii has given education high priority in its projected plans for research and study by scholars and fellows in international development; and a new Center for Comparative Education at Stanford will conduct research and train educational strategies to aid in the educational planning for developing nations.

Education has found a prominent place in the Office of Human Resources and Social Development of AID. I am assured that education will receive high priority in the plans of the new section on Research, Evaluation, and Planning Assistance which has been charged with contracting for research that will assist in improving the Government's foreign assistance program. Meanwhile the Peace Corps, has launched into the research field with enormous gusto. A conference held in Washington on March 4–5, 1963, on "The Behavioral Sciences and the Peace Corps" exhibited a range and vitality of research studies that are bound to have the wide repercussions throughout the academic world and probably the length and breadth of international development. It took years to convince ICA/AID that research was necessary; the Peace Corps apparently needed little persuading. I am sure that significant moves are being taken elsewhere as well, but the tasks are so great and so urgent that much more needs to be done.

---

[1] See, for example, the titles in the Bibliography by Coelho, Hagen, Isaacs, Lerner, Milikan, Pye, Rivkin, Restow, and Shils, pp. 126–128.

[2] See, for example, Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman (eds.), *The Politics of the Developing Areas* (Princeton, N.J.; Princeton University Press 1960); and the Brookings Institution, *Development of the Emerging Countries; an Agenda for Research* (Washington, D.C.: the Brookings Institution, 1962).

The main point is clear: In 15 years we have done much and we have learned much, but our experience and our studies need a vast amount of sifting and evaluation; and new programs of research should be launched to give sure-footed guidelines for building the future policies and activities of America's assistance role in international education. Social science centers should enlist the aid of professional educators on their staffs, and graduate schools of education should enlist the aid of social scientists on *their* staffs. All programs of technical assistance should have research study built in as a matter of course. Now that almost everyone has discovered on paper how important education is, we must get down to work to see what it has actually done and what it can do.

One purpose of research should be to analyze and appraise recent American educational programs as these have sought to aid other countries to improve their educational systems and processes. This research should be designed to describe and assess the educational practices, theories, and assumptions upon which our policies of international cooperation have been based, to discover and evaluate what has happened under varying conditions in different countries and regions of the world as a result of these policies, and to formulate principles that may guide the improvement of educational assistance policies in the future.

Particular attention should be given to projects sponsored by AID and the Peace Corps, but it would also be desirable to study the programs of voluntary agencies in order to gain a knowledge of comparable and contrasting theories and practices. This kind of policy research should seek basically to organize and extend the body of tested knowledge that will improve the theories and practices involved in American programs of assistance for the educational development of other countries. It should continue for periods long enough to validate the knowledge; for at least 5 years and, preferably, 10 years.

Policy research should include analysis of the fundamental assumptions and operational practices of the AID and Peace Corps university contracts in education. We need to know precisely, for example, how effective have been the selection, orientation, training, programs, and overseas performance of contract technicians and Peace Corps trainees. We should assess carefully the selection, training, and performance of the educational advisers of AID and the country representatives who have supervised Peace Corps teachers overseas. We should learn much more about the advantages and disadvantages of the training programs for students and educators from other countries who have come to America to study in the field of education and what happens to them upon their return home.

Underlying such practical questions of policy research in international education should be the continuing and long-range programs of empirical and theoretical research designed to develop warrantable generalizations concerning the fundamental role of education in the modernization process, national development, and social change. The most pervasive characteristic of recent times is the unparalleled extent and rate of change occurring among the various peoples and cultures of the world. As I have said earlier, the whole program of technical assistance itself is in essence a matter of deliberate education in social change, and every such program of social change involves the ideas, beliefs, customs, and education of the people involved, both senders and receivers.

In the long view, therefore, nothing could be more fundamentally important for the entire cooperative assistance enterprise than well-conceived, well-executed, independent programs of basic research on the direction, character, and prediction of social change as related to education. Basic research in the theory and practice of international education could be as important for designing technical assistance programs that will genuinely aid national development as basic research in the physical sciences is important for technological and developmental improvement in industry, government, space exploration, and national defense.

In order to deal with questions of policy as well as of fundamental social change the research should be interdisciplinary as well as international. The problems that face policymakers as a result of social change cannot be limited to one field of activity nor to one field of knowledge. Each social science discipline has a special contribution to make in method or in substance. To marshal what is already known in a variety of social sciences and to conduct new research, scholars should be enlisted who are trained to see the relation of education to economics, political science, sociology, authropology, social psychology, history, international relations, and comparative cultures.

In order to make better plans for the development of education in the economic, political, and social modernization of country X, research staffs would need to bring to bear what is already known about the direction in which the economy, government, and education of country X is moving, what is known about the dynamics of technological and social change in other countries at similar stages of development, and what happens educationally when new technology, new ideas, or new forms of social organization are introduced from one culture to another. Specific studies of the role of education in the political, economic, and sociological development of the particular country would be desirable. A large amount of rapidly growing knowledge in comparative education would need sifting, analysis, evaluation, and coordination.

Finally, new designs for research in country X would need to be drawn up to test what happens when various educational plans and policies are put into effect. Can we find shortcuts through the routes of urbanization, growth of literacy, and increased communication that have historically led to the modernization of traditional societies? Does the expansion of primary schools to extend literacy actually lead to increased per captia income? Can illiteracy be reduced as effectively by means of the "new technology" represented by learning machines, programed instruction, and mass media of communication as by training large numbers of primary school teachers? Do changes in curriculum content or pedagogical method have any noticeable effect upon the political, economical, or psychological development of a people? If more students are diverted to the sciences in the secondary schools, what happens to the standards of public administration as well as to the rate of industrialization? Does expanded opportunity for secondary education lead to greater social mobility or simply to greater unemployment among an educated elite? What happens if rural schools are expanded at the expense of urban schools, or technical studies at the expense of general studies, or universities at the expense of teacher training colleges? What happens to an educational aid program when a government "nationalizes" its schools? Does the introduction of American educational policies or practices into a dominantly French or British type of school or university system have good or ill effects? What are the relative advantages of multilateral as compared with bilateral educational aid programs? Does any change in curriculum or plan for education have much effect unless the examination system is changed?

Dozens of other research questions will come readily to mind for those who must make educational plans. Throughout the research enterprise the nationals of country X itself should be deeply involved in planning, gathering data, evaluating results, and formulating generalizations. Where necessary the training of nationals in research methods should be a prime objective of the assistance program.

Another type of basic research has to do with the way the dominant attitudes, behavior patterns, value systems, or personality characteristics of the people of country Y affect the development of education and the educational assistance programs. Relevant studies of nationalism and colonialism need to be brought to bear and evaluated. The new field of attitude research in modernizing areas, political behavior in international relations, stereotypes and images of foreigners, nonverbal communication patterns, and international communication may have relevance.

Building upon what is already known, special research could then be carried forward to see what role education does play and can play in creating and changing the images that the people of country Y hold of other peoples. Meanwhile, long-range studies of the way personal outlooks, interpersonal relations, and national attitudes are generated and changed and the role education plays therein should be pursued. We should continue to study the personal, social, and intellectual characteristics required by Americans in successful cross-cultural contact and international cooperation. Much more sensitive and difficult but equally important would be studies of what kind of personal and professional characteristics make host-country nationals effective or ineffective as they take part in the educational assistance transaction.

In all this we should be alert to develop a new breed of development educators knowledgeable in international studies, skilled in the arts of educational assistance, and devoted to the tasks of educational planning, and development in modernizing nations. Their study of the international aspects of education, economics, politics, sociology, anthropology, and psychology should enable them to relate educational planning to the overall national development of technology, industry, agriculture, political organization, and health and welfare services. Their task is to focus on the function of education in the total effort to improve the conditions of life in a rapidly developing society and in the total process by which people are motivated to help themselves through community, national, and international action.

Too often formal education has been neglected in this task. Professional educators and social scientists often look upon "education" simply as a formal school matter unrelated to the fundamental changes going on in a country's industry, agriculture, public administration, or health services. On the contrary, "education" should be viewed as including informal, community, and adult education as well as that which goes on inside schools and universities. Technical assistance programs will be improved, and education in both its formal and informal senses will make a greater contribution if they are seen as integral parts of a total enterprise of international development. We not only need greater attention to the part that education can and must play in international development; we also need much more explicit recognition and study of the educational role of technical assistance itself.

So far the research on technical assistance has been far too spotty and inadequate, but the training programs for overseas educational advisers have been even more spotty or nonexistent—with but a few notable exceptions. Part of the difficulty has been the excessive speed with which technicians have been sent overseas, often after interminable delays in arriving at the decision to send them at all. Part of the difficulty, too, has been the lack of conviction on the part of some ICA/AID officials and some Congressmen that training is necessary or represents a legitimate use of funds. But even when these elements are not present, it has been difficult to gather enough people together who are going to a particular country at the same time to warrant mounting a full-scale training program for them.

In this respect, the new projects for sending large numbers of teachers and Peace Corps volunteers overseas have great advantage over the classic technical assistance approach. Training programs for this new stage in American international education have been able to profit from shortcomings revealed in technical assistance projects. In return, revitalized educational assistance programs can now take place if they will draw upon the accumulations of international knowledge that are being developed in university centers of social science research, if professional educators can play a larger and more central role in the preparation of the American and foreign participants, and if something of the youthful eagerness, service motivation, and lively intelligence of the young overseas teachers can be injected into the endeavors of the more mature overseas professors.

When the intellectual and scholarly resources of the new international studies are teamed up on one side with the skills and wisdom of highly trained technical assistance advisers and harnessed on the other side with the educational arts of a large corps of qualified American teachers, not only will the image of America abroad be radically changed but the countries concerned will have available for their national development the best combination of America's educational talents. America's troika in the race for international education assistance will be unbeatable. (*American Education in International Development.*)

THE ETHICS OF OVERSEAS RESEARCH

The Life and Death of Project Camelot

*by Irving Louis Horowitz**

When its existence became public knowledge in midsummer of 1965 Project Camelot—a U.S. Army-sponsored research project for measuring and forecasting the causes of revolution and insurgency in underdeveloped areas—created a foreign policy furor and set off an ongoing reappraisal of the role of social scientists and their relationships with Government agencies. Mr. Horowitz is professor of sociology at Washington University, St. Louis, and Senior editor of the periodical Trans-action.

In June of [1965]—in the midst of the crisis over the Dominican Republic—the U.S. Ambassador to Chile sent an urgent and angry cable to the State Department. Ambassador Ralph Dungan was confronted with a growing outburst of anti-Americanism from Chilean newspapers and intellectuals. Further, leftwing members of the Chilean Senate had accused the United States of espionage.

The anti-American attacks that agitated Dungan had no direct connection with sending U.S. troops to Santo Domingo. Their target was a mysterious and cloudy American research program called Project Camelot.

Dungan wanted to know from the State Department what Project Camelot was all about. Further, whatever Camelot was, he wanted it stopped because it was fast becoming a *cause célèbre* in Chile (as it soon would throughout capitals of Latin America and in Washington) and Dungan had not ben told anything about it—even though it was sponsored by the U.S. Army and involved the tinderbox subjects of counter-revolution and counter-insurgency in Latin America.

Within a few weeks Project Camelot created repercussions from Capitol Hill to the White House. Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, registered his personal concern about such projects as Camelot because of their "reactionary, backwardlooking policy opposed to change. Implicit in Camelot, as in the concept of 'counter-insurgency,' is an assumption that revolutionary movements are dangerous to the interests of the United States and that the United States must be prepared to assist, if not actually to participate in, measures to repress them."

By mid-June the State Department and Defense Department—which had created and funded Camelot—were in open contention over the project and the jurisdiction each department should have over certain foreign policy operations.

On July 8, Project Camelot was killed by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's office, which has a veto power over the military budget. The decision had been made under the President's direction.

---

*© 1965 Community Leadership project, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

On that same day, the director of Camelot's parent body, the Special Operations Research Organization, told a congressional committee that the research project on revolution and counter-insurgency had taken its name from King Arthur's mythical domain because "it connotes the right sort of things—development of a stable society with peace and justice for all." Whatever Camelot's outcome, there should be no mistaking the deep sincerity behind this appeal for an applied social science pertinent to current policy.

However, Camelot left a horizon of disarray in its wake: an open dispute between State and Defense; fuel for the anti-American fires in Latin America; a cut in U.S. Army research appropriations. In addition, serious and perhaps ominous implications for social science research, bordering on censorship, have been raised by the heated reaction of the executive branch of Government.

GLOBAL COUNTER-INSURGENCY

What was Project Camelot? Basically, it was a project for measuring and forecasting the causes of revolutions and insurgency in underdeveloped areas of the world. It also aimed to find ways of eliminating the causes, or coping with the revolutions and insurgencies. Camelot was sponsored by the U.S. Army on a $4 to $6 million contract, spaced out over 3 to 4 years, with the Special Operations Research Organization (SORO). This agency is nominally under the aegis of American University in Washington, D.C., and does a variety of research for the Army. This includes making analytical surveys of foreign areas; keeping up-to-date information on the military, political, and social complexes of those areas; and maintaining a "rapid response" file for getting immediate information, upon Army request, on any situation deemed militarily important.

Latin America was the first area chosen for concentrated study, but countries on Camelot's 4-year list included some in Asia, Africa, and Europe. In a working paper issued on December 5, 1964, at the request of the Office of the Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, it was recommended that "comparative historical studies" be made in these countries:

(Latin America) Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela.
(Middle East) Egypt, Iran, Turkey.
(Far East) Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand.
(Others) France, Greece, Nigeria.

"Survey research and other field studies" were recommended for Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela, Iran, Thailand. Preliminary consideration was also being given to a study of the separatist movement in French Canada. It, too, had a code name: Project Revolt.

In a recruiting letter sent to selected scholars all over the world at the end of 1964, Project Camelot's aims were defined as a study to "make it possible to predict and influence politically significant aspects of social change in the developing nations of the world." This would include devising procedures for "assessing the potential for internal war within national societies" and "identify(ing) with increased degress of confidence, those actions which a government might take to relieve conditions which are assessed as giving rise to a potential for internal war." The letter further stated:

> The U.S. Army has an important mission in the positive and constructive aspects of nation-building in less developed countries as well as a responsibility to assist friendly governments in dealing with active insurgency problems.

Such activities by the U.S. Army were described as "insurgency prophylaxis" rather than the "sometimes misleading label of counterinsurgency."

Project Camelot was conceived in late 1963 by a group of high-ranking Army officers connected with the Army Research Office of the Department of Defense. They were concerned about new types of warfare springing up around the world. Revolutions in Cuba and Yemen and insurgency movements in Vietnam and the Congo were a far cry from the battles of World War II and also different from the envisioned—and planned for—apocalypse of nuclear war. For the first time in modern warfare, military establishments were not in a position to use the immense arsenals at their disposal—but were, instead, compelled by force of a geopolitical stalemate to increasingly engage in primitive forms of armed combat. The questions of moment for the Army were: Why can't the "hardware" be used? And what alternatives can social science "software" provide?

A well-known Latin American area specialist, Rex Hopper, was chosen as director of Project Camelot. Hopper was a professor of sociology and chairman of the department at Brooklyn College. He had been to Latin America many times over a 30-year span on research projects and lecture tours, including some under Government sponsorship. He was highly recommended for the position by his professional associates in Washington and elsewhere. Hopper had a long-standing interest in problems of revolution and saw in this multimillion dollar contract the possible realization of a life-long scientific ambition.

THE CHILEAN DEBACLE

How did this social science research project create a foreign policy furor? And, at another level, how did such high intentions result in so disastrous an outcome?

The answers involve a network spreading from a professor of anthropology at the University of Pittsburgh, to a professor of sociology at the University of Oslo, and yet a third professor of sociology at the University of Chile in Santiago, Chile. The "showdown" took place in Chile, first within the confines of the university, next on the floor of the Chilean Senate, then in the popular press of Santiago, and finally, behind U.S. embassy walls.

It was ironic that Chile was the scene of wild newspaper tales of spying and academic outrage at scholars being recruited for "spying missions." For the working papers of Project Camelot stipulated as a criterion for study that a country "should show promise of high payoffs in terms of the kinds of data required." Chile did not meet these requirements—it is not on the preliminary list of nations specified as prospects.

How then did Chile become involved in Project Camelot's affairs? The answer requires consideration of the position of Hugo G. Nutini, assistant professor of anthropology at Pittsburgh, citizen of the United States and former citizen of Chile. His presence in Santiago as a self-identified Camelot representative triggered the climactic chain of events.

Nutini, who inquired about an appointment in Camelot's beginning stages, never was given a regular Camelot appointment. Because he was planning a trip to Chile in April of this year—on other academic business—he was asked to prepare a report concerning possibilities of co-operation from Chilean scholars. In general, it was the kind of survey which has mild results and a modest honorarium attached to it (Nutini was offered $750). But Nutini had an obviously different notion of his role. Despite the limitations and precautions which Rex Hopper placed on his trip, especially Hopper's insistence on its informal nature, Nutini managed to convey the impression of being an official of Project Camelot with the authority to make proposals to prospective Chilean participants. Here was an opportunity to link the country of his birth with the country of his choice.

At about the same time, Johan Galtung, a Norwegian sociologist famous for his research on conflict and conflict resolution in underdeveloped areas, especially in Latin America, entered the picture. Galtung, who was in Chile at the time and associated with the Latin American Faculty of Social Science (FLACSO), received an invitation to participate in a Camelot planning conference scheduled for Washington, D.C., in August 1965. The fee to social scientists attending the conference would be $2,000 for 4 weeks. Galtung turned down the invitation. He gave several reasons. He could not accept the role of the U.S. Army as a sponsoring agent in a study of counter-insurgency. He could not accept the notion of the Army as an agency of national development; he saw the Army as managing conflict and even promoting conflict. Finally, he could not accept the asymmetry of the project—he found it difficult to understand why there would be studies of counter-insurgency in Latin-America, but no studies of "counter-intervention" (conditions under which Latin American nations might intervene in the affairs of the United States). Galtung was also deeply concerned about the possibility of European scholars being frozen out of Latin American studies by a inundation of sociologists from the United States. Furthermore, he expressed fears that the scale of Camelot honoraria would completely destroy the social science labor market in Latin America.

Galtung had spoken to others in Oslo, Santiago, and throughout Latin America about the project, and he had shown the memorandum of December 1964 to many of his colleagues.

Soon after Nutini arrived in Santiago, he had a conference with Vice-Chancellor Alvaro Bunster of the University of Chile to discuss the character of Project Camelot. Their second meeting, arranged by the vice-chancellor, was also attended by Prof. Eduardo Fuenzalida, a sociologist. After a half-hour of exposition by Nutini, Fuenzalida asked him pointblank to specify the ultimate aims of the project, its sponsors, and its military implications. Before Nutini could reply, Professor Fuenzalida, apparently with some drama, pulled a copy of the December 4 circular letter from his briefcase and read a prepared Spanish translation. Simultaneously, the authorities at FLACSO turned over the matter to their associates in the Chilean Senate and in the left-wing Chilean press.

In Washington, under the political pressures of State Department officials and congressional reaction, Project Camelot was halted in midstream, or more precisely, before it ever really got underway. When the ambassador's communication reached Washington, there was already considerable official ferment about Project Camelot. Senators Fulbright, Morse, and McCarthy soon asked for hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Only an agreement between Secretary of Defense McNamara and Secretary of State Rusk to settle their differences on future oversea research projects forestalled Senate action. But in the House of Representatives, a hearing was conducted by the Foreign Affairs Committee on July 8. The SORO director, Theodore Vallance, was questioned by committee members on the worth of Camelot and the matter of military intrusion into foreign policy areas.

That morning, even before Vallance was sworn in as a witness—and without his knowledge—the Defense Department issued a terse announcement terminating Project Camelot. President Johnson had decided the issue in favor of the State Department. In a memo to Secretary Rusk on August 5 the President stipulated that "no Government sponsorship of foreign area research should be undertaken which in the judgment of the Secretary of State would adversely affect United States foreign relations."

The State Department has recently established machinery to screen and judge all federally financed research projects overseas. The policy and research consequences of the Presidential directive will be discussed later.

What effect will the cancellation of Camelot have on the continuing rivalry between Defense and State Departments for primacy in foreign policy? How will Government sponsorship of future social science research be affected? And was Project Camelot a scholarly protective cover for U.S. Army planning—or a legitimate research operation on a valid research subject independent of sponsorship?

Let us begin with a collective self-portrait of Camelot as the social scientists who directed the project perceived it. There seems to be general consensus on seven points.

First, the men who went to work for Camelot felt the need for a large-scale, "big picture" project in social science. They wanted to create a sociology of contemporary relevance which would not suffer from the parochial narrowness of vision to which their own professional backgrounds had generally conditioned them. Most of the men viewed Camelot as a bona fide opportunity to do fundamental research with relatively unlimited funds at their disposal. (No social science project ever before had up to $6,000,000 available.) Under such optimal conditions, these scholars tended not to look a gift horse in the mouth. As one of them put it, there was no desire to inquire too deeply as to the source of the funds or the ultimate purpose of the project.

Second, most social scientists affiliated with Camelot felt that there was actually more freedom to do fundamental research under military sponsorship than at a university or college. One man noted that during the 1950's there was far more freedom to do fundamental research in the RAND corporation (an Air Force research organization) than on any campus in America. Indeed, once the protective covering of RAND was adopted, it was almost viewed as a society of Platonist elites or "knowers" permitted to search for truth on behalf of the powerful. In a neoplatonic definition of their situation, the Camelot men hoped that their ideas would be taken seriously by the wielders of power (although, conversely, they were convinced that the Armed Forces would not accept their preliminary recommendations).

Third, many of the Camelot associates felt distinctly uncomfortable with military sponsorship, especially given the present U.S. military posture. But their reaction to this discomfort was that "the Army has to be educated." This view was sometimes cast in Freudian terms: the Army's bent toward violence ought to be sublimated. Underlying this theme was the notion of the Armed Forces as an agency for potential social good—the discipline and the order embodied by an army could be channeled into the process of economic and social development in the United States as well as in Latin America.

Fourth, there was a profound conviction in the perfectibility of mankind; particularly in the possibility of the military establishment performing a major role in the general process of growth. They sought to correct the intellectual paternalism and parochialism under which Pentagon generals, State Department diplomats, and Defense Department planners seemed to operate.

Fifth, a major long-range purpose of Camelot, at least for some of its policymakers, was to prevent another revolutionary holocaust on a grand scale, such as occurred in Cuba. At the very least, there was a shared belief that *Pax Americana* was severely threatened and its future could be bolstered.

Sixth, none of them viewed their role on the project as spying for the U.S. Government, or for anyone else.

Seventh, the men on Project Camelot felt that they made heavy sacrifices for social science. Their personal and professional risks were much higher than those taken by university academics. Government work, while well-compensated, remains professionally marginal. It can be terminated abruptly (as indeed was the case) and its project directors are subject to a public scrutiny not customary behind the walls of ivy.

In the main, there was perhaps a keener desire on the part of the directing members of Camelot not to "sell out" than there is among social scientists with regular academic appointments. This concern with the ethics of social science research seemed to be due largely to daily confrontation of the problems of betrayal, treason, secrecy, and abuse of data, in a critical situation. In contrast, even though a university position may be created by federally sponsored research, the connection with policy matters is often too remote to cause any *crise de conscience*.

THE INSIDERS REPORT

Were the men on Camelot critical of any aspects of the project?

Some had doubts from the outset about the character of the work they would be doing, and about the conditions under which it would be done. It was pointed out, for example, that the U.S. Army tends to exercise a far more stringent intellectual control of research findings than does the U.S. Air Force. As evidence for this, it was stated that SORO generally had fewer "free-wheeling" aspects to its research designs than did RAND. * * * One critic inside SORO went so far as to say that he knew of no SORO research which had a "playful" or unregimented quality, such as one finds at RAND (where for example, computers are used to plan invasions but also to play chess). One staff member said that "the self-conscious seriousness gets to you after a while." "It was all grim stuff," said another.

Another line of criticism was that pressures on the "reformers" (as the men engaged in Camelot research spoke of themselves) to come up with ideas were much stronger than the pressures on the military to actually bring off any policy changes recommended. The social scientists were expected to be social reformers, while the military adjutants were expected to be conservative. It was further felt that the relationship between sponsors and researchers was not one of equals, but rather one of superordinate military needs and subordinate academic roles. On the other hand, some officials were impressed by the disinterestedness of the military, and thought that far from exercising undue influence, the Army personnel were loath to offer opinions.

Another objection was that if one had to work on policy matters—if research is to have international ramifications—it might better be conducted under conventional State Department sponsorship. "After all," one man said, "they are at least nominally committed to civilian political norms." In other words, there was a considerable reluctance to believe that the Defense Department, despite its superior organization, greater financial affluence, and executive influence, would actually improve upon State Department styles of work, or accept recommendations at variance with Pentagon policies.

There seemed to be few, if any, expressions of disrespect for the intrinsic merit of the work contemplated by Camelot, or of disdain for policy-oriented work in general. The scholars engaged in the Camelot effort used two distinct vocabularies. The various Camelot documents reveal a miltary vocabulary provided with an array of military justifications; often followed (within the same document) by a social science vocabulary offering social science justifications and rationalizations. The dilemma in the Camelot literature from the preliminary report issued in August 1964 until the more advanced document issued in April 1965, is the same: an incomplete amalgamation of the military and sociological vocabularies. (At an early date the project had the code name Spearpoint.)

POLICY CONFLICTS OVER CAMELOT

The directors of SORO are concerned that the cancellation of Camelot might mean the end of SORO as well in a wholesale slash of research funds. For while over $1 million was allotted to Camelot each year, the annual budget of SORO, its parent organization, is a good deal less. Although no such action has taken place, SORO's future is being examined. For example, the Senate and House Appropriations Committees blocked a move by the Army to transfer unused Camelot funds to SORO.

However, the end of Project Camelot does not necessarily imply the end of the Special Operations Research Office, nor does it imply an end to research designs which are similar in character to Project Camelot. In fact, the termination of the contract does not even imply an intellectual change of heart on the part of the originating sponsors or key figures of the project.

One of the characteristics of Project Camelot was the number of antagonistic forces it set in motion on grounds of strategy and timing rather than from what may be called considerations of scientific principles.

The State Department grounded its opposition to Camelot on the basis of the ultimate authority it has in the area of foreign affairs. There is no published report showing serious criticism of the projected research itself.

Congressional opposition seemed to be generated by a concern not to rock any foreign alliances, especially in Latin America. Again, there was no statement about the project's scientific or intellectual grounds.

A third group of skeptics, academic social scientists, generally thought that Project Camelot, and studies of the processes of revolution and war in general, were better left in the control of major university centers, and in this way, kept free of direct military supervision.

The Army, creator of the project, did nothing to contradict McNamara's order canceling Project Camelot. Army influentials did not only feel that they had to execute the Defense Department's orders, but they are traditionally dubious of the value of "software" research to support "hardware" systems.

Let us take a closer look at each of these groups which voiced opposition to Project Camelot. A number of issues did not so much hinge upon, as swim about, Project Camelot. In particular, the "jurisdictional" dispute between Defense and State loomed largest.

State versus *Defense*.—In substance, the debate between the Defense Department and the State Department is not unlike that between electricians and bricklayers in the construction of a new apartment house. What "union is responsible for which process? Less generously, the issue is: who controls what? At the policy level, Camelot was a tool tossed about in a larger power struggle which has been going on in government circles since the end of World War II, when the Defense Department emerged as a competitor for honors as the most powerful bureau of the administrative branch of government.

In some sense, the divisions between Defense and State are outcomes of the rise of ambiguous conflicts such as Korea and Vietnam, in contrast to the more precise and diplomatically controlled "classical" world wars. What are the lines dividing political policy from military posture? Who is the most important representative of the United States abroad: the Ambassador or the military attaché in charge of the military mission? When soldiers from foreign lands are sent to the United States for political orientation, should such orientation be within the province of the State Department or of the Defense Department? When undercover activities are conducted, should the direction of such activities belong to military or political authorities? Each of these is a strategic question with little pragmatic or historic precedent. Each of these was entwined in the Project Camelot explosion.

It should be plain, therefore, that the State Department was not simply responding to the recommendations of Chilean leftwingers in urging the cancellation of Camelot. It merely employed the Chilean hostility to "interventionist" projects as an opportunity to redefine the balance of forces and power with the Defense Department. What is clear from this resistance to such projects is not so much a defense of the sovereignty of the nations where ambassadors are stationed, as it is a contention that conventional political channels are sufficient to yield the information desired or deemed necessary.

Congress.—In the main, congressional reaction seems to be that Project Camelot was bad because it rocked the diplomatic boat in a sensitive area. Underlying most congressional criticisms is the plain fact that most Congressmen are more sympathetic to State Department control of foreign affairs than they are to Defense Department control. In other words, despite military sponsored world junkets, National Guard and State Guard pressures from the home State, and military training in the backgrounds of many Congressmen, the sentiment for political rather than military control is greater. In addition, there is a mounting suspicion in Congress of varying kinds of behavioral science research stemming from hearings into such matters as wiretapping, uses of lie detectors, and truth-in-packaging.

Social Scientists.—One reason for the violent response to Project Camelot, especially among Latin American scholars, is its sponsorship by the Department of Defense. The fact is that Latin Americans have become quite accustomed to State Department involvements in the internal affairs of various nations. The Defense Department is a newcomer, a dangerous one, inside the Latin American orbit. The train of thought connected to its activities is in terms of international warfare, spying missions, military manipulations, etc. The State Department, for its part, is often a consultative party to shifts in government, and has played an enormous part in either fending off or bringing about *coups d'état*. This State Department role has by now been accepted and even taken for granted. Not so the Defense Department's role. But it is interesting to conjecture on how matter-of-factly Camelot might have been accepted if it had State Department sponsorship.

Social scientists in the United States have, for the most part, been publicly silent on the matter of Camelot. The reasons for this are not hard to find. First, many "giants of the field" are involved in government contract work in one capacity or another. And few souls are in a position to tamper with the gods. Second, most information on Project Camelot has thus far been of a newspaper variety; and professional men are not in a habit of criticizing colleagues on the basis of such information. Third, many social scientists doubtless see nothing wrong or immoral in the Project Camelot designs. And they are therefore more likely to be either confused or angered at the Latin American response than at the directors of Project Camelot. (At the time of the blowup, Camelot people spoke about the "Chilean mess" rather than the "Camelot mess.")

The directors of Project Camelot did not "classify" research materials, so that there would be no stigma of secrecy. And they also tried to hire, and even hired away from academic positions, people well known and respected for their independence of mind. The difficulty is that even though the stigma of secrecy was formally erased, it remained in the attitudes of many of the employees and would-be employees of Project Camelot. They unfortunately thought in terms of secrecy, clearance, missions, and the rest of the professional nonsense that so powerfully afflicts the Washington scientific as well as political ambience.

Further, it is apparent that Project Camelot had much greater difficulty hiring a full-time staff of high professional competence, than in getting part-time, summertime, weekend, and sundry assistance. Few established figures in academic life were willing to surrender the advantages of their positions for the risks of the project.

One of the cloudiest aspects to Project Camelot is the role of American University. Its actual supervision of the contract appears to have begun and ended with the 25 percent overhead on those parts of the contract that a university receives on most federal grants. Thus, while there can be no question as to the "concern and disappointment" of President Hurst R. Anderson of the American University over the demise of Project Camelot, the reasons for this regret do not seem to extend beyond the formal and the financial. No official at American University appears to have been willing to make any statement of responsibility, support, chagrin, opposition, or anything else related to the project. The issues are indeed momentous, and must be faced by all universities at which government sponsored research is conducted: the amount of control a university has over contract work; the role of university officials in the distribution of funds from grants; the relationships that ought to be established once a grant is issued. There is also a major question concerning project directors: are they members of the faculty, and if so, do they have necessary teaching responsibilities and opportunities for tenure as do other faculty members.

The difficulty with American University is that it seems to be remarkably unlike other universities in its permissiveness. The Special Operations Research Office received neither guidance nor support from university officials. From the outset, there seems to have been a "gentleman's agreement" not to inquire or interfere in Project Camelot, but simply to serve as some sort of camouflage. If American University were genuinely autonomous it might have been able to lend highly supportive aid to Project Camelot during the crisis months. As it is, American University maintained an official silence which preserved it from more congressional or executive criticism. This points up some serious flaws in its administrative and financial policies.

The relationship of Camelot to SORO represented a similarly muddled organizational picture. The director of Project Camelot was nominally autonomous and in charge of an organization surpassing in size and importance the overall SORO operation. Yet at the critical point the organizational blueprint served to protect SORO and sacrifice what nominally was its limb. That Camelot happened to be a vital organ may have hurt, especially when Congress blocked the transfer of unused Camelot funds to SORO.

Military.—Military reaction to the cancellation of Camelot varied. It should be borne in mind that expenditures on Camelot were minimal in the Army's overall budget and most military leaders are skeptical, to begin with, about the worth of social science research. So there was no open protest about the demise of Camelot. Those officers who have a positive attitude toward social science materials, or are themselves trained in the social sciences, were dismayed. Some had hoped to find "software" alternatives to the "hardware systems" approach applied by the Secretary of Defense to every military-political contingency. These officers saw the attack on Camelot as a double attack—on their role as officers and on their professional standards. But the Army was so clearly treading in new waters that it could scarcely jeopardize the entire structure of military research to preserve one project. This very inability or impotence to preserve Camelot—a situation threatening to other governmental contracts with social scientists—no doubt impressed many Armed Forces officers.

The claim is made by the Camelot staff (and various military aides) that the critics of the project played into the hands of those sections of the military predisposed to veto any social science recommendations. Then why did the military offer such a huge support to a social science project to begin with? Because $6 million is actually a trifling sum for the Army in an age of multibillion dollar Military Establishment. The amount is significantly more important for the social sciences, where such contract awards remain relatively scarce. Thus, there were differing perspectives of the importance of Camelot: an Army view which considered the contract as one of several forms of "software" investment; a social science perception of Project Camelot as the equivalent of the Manhattan Project.

WAS PROJECT CAMELOT WORKABLE?

While most public opposition to Project Camelot focused on its strategy and timing, a considerable amount of private opposition centered on more basic, though theoretical, questions: was Camelot scientifically feasible and ethically correct? No public document or statement contested the possibility that, given the successful completion of the data gathering, Camelot could have, indeed, established basic criteria for measuring the level and potential for internal war in a given nation. Thus, by never challenging the feasibility of the work, the political critics of Project Camelot were providing back-handed compliments to the efficacy of the project.

But much more than political considerations are involved. It is clear that some of the most critical problems presented by Project Camelot are scientific. Although for an extensive analysis of Camelot, the reader would, in fairness, have to be familiar with all of its documents, salient general criticisms can be made without a full reading.

The research design of Camelot was from the outset plagued by ambiguities. It was never quite settled whether the purpose was to study counterinsurgency possibilities, or the revolutionary process. Similarly, it was difficult to determine whether it was to be a study of comparative social structures, a set of case studies of single nations "in depth," or a study of social structure with particular emphasis on the military. In addition, there was a lack of treatment of what indicators were to be used, and whether a given social system in nation A could be as stable in nation B.

In one Camelot document there is a general critique of social science for failing to deal with social conflict and social control. While this in itself is admirable, the tenor and context of Camelot's documents make it plain that a "stable society" is considered the norm no less than the desired outcome. The "breakdown of social order" is spoken of accusatively. Stabilizing agencies in developing areas are presumed to be absent. There is no critique of U.S. Army policy in developing areas because the Army is presumed to be a stabilizing agency. The research formulations always assume the legitimacy of Army tasks—"if the U.S. Army is to perform effectively its parts in the U.S. mission of counterinsurgency it must recognize that insurgency represents a breakdown of social order. * * *" But such a proposition has never been doubted—by Army officials or anyone else. The issue is whether such breakdowns are in the nature of the existing system or a product of conspiratorial movements.

The use of hygienic language disguises the antirevolutionary assumptions under a cloud of powder puff declarations. For example, studies of Paraguay are recommended "because trends in this situation (the Stroessner regime) may also render it 'unique' when analyzed in terms of the transition from 'dictatorship' to political stability." But to speak about changes from dictatorship to stability is an obvious ruse. In this case, it is a tactic to disguise the fact that Paraguay is one of the most vicious, undemocratic (and like most dictatorships, stable) societies in the Western Hemisphere.

These typify the sort of hygienic sociological premises that do not have scientific purposes. They illustrate the confusion of commitments within Project Camelot. Indeed the very absence of emotive words such as revolutionary masses, communism, socialism, and capitalism only serves to intensify the discomfort one must feel on examination of the documents—since the abstract vocabulary disguises, rather than resolves, the problems of international revolution. To have used clearly political rather than military language would not "justify" governmental support. Furthermore, shabby assumptions of academic conventionalism replaced innovative orientations. By adopting a systems approach, the problematic, open-ended aspects of the study of revolutions were largely omitted; and the design of the study became an oppressive curb on the study of the problems inspected.

This points up a critical implication for Camelot (as well as other projects). The importance of the subject being researched does not *per se* determine the importance of the project. A sociology of large-scale relevance and reference is all to the good. It is important that scholars be willing to risk something of their shaky reputations in helping resolve major world social problems. But it is no less urgent that in the process of addressing major problems, the autonomous character of the social science disciplines—their own criteria of worthwhile scholarship—should not be abandoned. Project Camelot lost sight of this "autonomous" social science character.

It never seemed to occur to its personnel to inquire into the desirability for successful revolution. This is just as solid a line of inquiry as the one stressed—the conditions under which revolutionary movements will be able to overthrow a government. Furthermore, they seem not to have thought about inquiring into the role of the United States in these countries. This points up the lack of symmetry. The problem should have been phrased to include the study of "us" as well as "them." It is not possible to make a decent analysis of a situation unless one takes into account the role of all the different people and groups involved in it; and there was no room in the design for such contingency analysis.

In discussing the policy impact on a social science research project, we should not overlook the difference between "contract" work and "grants." Project Camelot commenced with the U.S. Army; that is to say, it was initiated for a practical purpose determined by the client. This differs markedly from the typical academic grant in that its sponsorship had "built-in" ends. The scholar usually *seeks* a grant; in this case the donor, the Army, promoted its own aims. In some measure, the hostility for Project Camelot may be an unconscious reflection of this distinction—a dim feeling that there was something "nonacademic," and certainly not disinterested, about Project Camelot, irrespective of the quality of the scholars associated with it.

THE ETHICS OF POLICY RESEARCH

The issue of "scientific rights" versus "social myths" is perennial. Some maintain that the scientist ought not penetrate beyond legally or morally sanctioned limits and others argue that such limits cannot exist for science. In treading on the sensitive issue of national sovereignty, Project Camelot reflects the generalized dilemma. In deference to intelligent researchers, in recognition of them as scholars, they should have been invited by Camelot to air their misgivings and qualms about Government (and especially Army sponsored) research—to declare their moral conscience. Instead, they were mistakenly approached as skillful, useful potential employees of a higher body, subject to an authority higher than their scientific calling.

What is central is not the political motives of the sponsor. For social scientists were not being enlisted in an intelligence system for "spying" purposes. But given their professional standing, their great sense of intellectual honor and pride, they could not be "employed" without proper deference for their stature. Professional authority should have prevailed from beginning to end with complete command of the right to thrash out the moral and political dilemmas as researchers saw them. The Army, however respectful and protective of free expression, was "hiring help" and not openly and honestly submitting a problem to the higher professional and scientific authority of social science.

The propriety of the Army to define and delimit all questions, which Camelot should have had a right to examine, was never placed in doubt. This is a tragic precedent; it reflects the arrogance of a consumer of intellectual merchandise. And this relationship of inequality corrupted the lines of authority, and profoundly limited the autonomy of the social scientists involved. It became clear that the social scientist savant was not so much functioning as an applied social scientist as he was supplying information to a powerful client.

The question of who sponsors research is not nearly so decisive as the question of ultimate use of such information. The sponsorship of a project, whether by the U.S. Army or by the Boy Scouts of America, is by itself neither good nor bad. Sponsorship is good or bad only insofar as the intended outcomes can be predetermined and the parameters of those intended outcomes tailored to the sponsor's expectations. Those social scientists critical of the project never really denied its freedom and independence, but questioned instead the purpose and character of its intended results.

It would be a gross oversimplification, if not an outright error, to assume that the theoretical problems of Project Camelot derive from any reactionary character of the project designers. The director went far and wide to select a group of men for the advisory board, the core planning group, the summer study group, and the various conference groupings, who in fact were more liberal in their orientations than any random sampling of the sociological profession would likely turn up.

However, in nearly every page of the various working papers, there are assertions which clearly derive from American military policy objectives rather than scientific method. The steady assumption that internal warfare is damaging disregards the possibility that a government may not be in a position to take actions either to relieve or improve mass conditions, or that such actions as are contemplated may be more concerned with reducing conflict than with improving conditions. The added statements above the U.S. Army and its "important mission in the positive and constructive aspects of nation building * * *" assumes the reality of such a function in an utterly unquestioning and unconvincing form. The first rule of the scientific game is not to make assumptions about friends and enemies in such a way as to promote the use of different criteria for the former and the latter.

The story of Project Camelot was not a confrontation of good versus evil. Obviously, not all men behaved with equal fidelity or with equal civility. Some men were weaker than others, some more callous, and some more stupid. But all of this is extrinsic to the heart of the problem of Camelot: what are and are not the legitimate functions of a scientist?

In conclusion, two important points must be clearly kept in mind and clearly apart. First, Project Camelot was intellectually, and from my own perspective, ideologically unsound. However, and more significantly, Camelot was not canceled because of its faulty intellectual approaches. Instead, its cancellation came as an act of government censorship, and an expression of the contempt for social science so prevalent among those who need it most. Thus it was political expedience, rather than its lack of scientific merit, that led to the demise of Camelot because it threatened to rock State Department relations with Latin America.

Second, giving the State Department the right to screen and approve Government-funded social science research projects on other countries, as the President has ordered, is a supreme act of censorship. Among the agencies that grant funds for such research are the National Institutes of Mental Health, the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and the Office of Education. Why should the State Department have veto power over the scientific pursuits of men and projects funded by these and other agencies in order to satisfy the policy needs—or policy failures—of the moment? President Johnson's directive is a gross violation of the autonomous nature of science.

We must be careful not to allow social science projects with which we may vociferously disagree on political and ideological grounds to be decimated or dismantled by government fiat. Across the ideological divide is a common social science understanding that the contemporary expression of reason in politics today is applied social science, and that the cancellation of Camelot, however pleasing it may be on political grounds to advocates of a civilian solution to Latin American affairs, represents a decisive setback for social science research. (*Transaction*, November-December 1965.)

American Academic Ethics and Social Research Abroad

*by Kalman H. Silvert**

Mr. Silvert, professor of government at Dartmouth, is director of studies for the American Universities Field Staff. In 1960–61 he directed a major study of the role of education in social and economic development in Latin America under a grant to the AUFS from the Carnegie Corp. of New York.

The academic problems sharpened, but not invented, by Project Camelot can be expressed in three relationships: the first, between social science and the Government; the second, between professional competence and integrity; and the third, between Latin American studies as such and the general performance of the American academic community.

The least difficult to discuss is the nature of the proper ties between the political and academic worlds. The trail has already been blazed by the physical scientists, and formalized procedures and institutions exist in all fields clearly defining the relationship of the scientist to his task, to the public, and to his profession. Legitimate differences of opinion exist, of course, concerning whether a scientist working on the "bomb" has a special citizenship duty, for example. But the public identification of interest is plain, and the set relationships to the policy process into which any physical scientist may wish to place himself are also evident.

No such clarity exists in the social sciences. We have no National Science Foundation discharging a brokerage function between the two worlds. We have had no such consistent public debates on academic objectivity and public commitment as have, say, the atomic physicists. No broadly accepted statement of ethics has come from our professional associations, and very few university administrations have concerned themselves with the problem.[1] The result has been that social scientists have generally crossed and recrossed the lines separating their functions from governmental policymaking, the only inhibitions being their personally held standards of conduct.

No problem of integrity exists for two polar groups of social scientists: those who work inside Government on a long-term basis, and those who because of their disciplines, research interests, or convictions stay entirely inside the university world. (A third group, the commercial contract scholar, sells his services where he wishes. His product is sometimes of very high quality. In any event, he does not concern us here because he has neither the pretensions nor the security of the academic scholar.) It is the social scientist working both fields who is in danger of betraying both of his masters through the loss of his powers of independent analysis. And he adds to his other academic difficulties a partial silence imposed by his access to classified materials, so that paradoxically he is often able to muster fewer data for his students than his uncompromised colleagues.

---

*© 1965 American Universities Field Staff, Inc. Reprinted by permission.

[1] There are a few exceptions, of course, among them Harvard University. The AUFS has always been highly sensitive to the problem, and throughout its existence has exercised extreme caution to remain entirely private and unencumbered.

A serious question exists whether social scientists under certain kinds of Government contract should continue to have the protection of academic tenure. As is well known, the purpose of tenure provisions is to assure academic freedom. But sometimes the exercise of such freedom is in conflict with necessary security provisions. More subtly, how does a scholar under contract know that he is adopting one hypothesis instead of another for truly scientific reasons, rather than because of a particular applied interest or even political prejudice? How can the persons reading the published work of this scholar know that he may have a personal, nonacademic involvement in the research? Recently many academicians have been pronouncing themselves on the international politics of southeast Asia. A letter to the editor of a major newspaper signed by a series of university professors may lead the unwary reader to think that a neutral, objective, academic opinion is being expressed. The wary reader, and the uncommonly informed one, will note that many of these letters are signed by persons who have been deeply involved in making the very policies they pretend to defend as objective scholars. Do these scholars think themselves beyond the lures of money, prestige, and personal political passion? If so, do they seriously expect the public at large to accept this self-estimation unquestioningly?

By no means am I suggesting that social scientists should turn their backs on policy questions, that governments should refrain from employing social scientists or using social science materials. What I am suggesting is that the peculiar attribute and unique scientific virtue of the university affiliated social scientist is his freedom. Once abridged, for whatever reason, then the people relying on his objectivity are in serious danger of accepting a misrepresented product, as many Government agencies have learned.

I am fully aware that individual personality factors may prevent a professor from benefiting from the security given him by tenure. I suggest, however, that institutionalized temptation to the voluntary relinquishment of freedom be avoided, in the expectation that personal idiosyncrasy will be canceled out of the final product by the numbers of persons engaged in the social sciences, as well as by the free exchanges in our increasingly numerous journals.

Let me add too, that I do not believe that our present state of ethical disarray has created a Frankenstein's monster rapidly conducing us to the socially engineered society. It is this possibility which has frightened some Chileans inordinately. *Ercilla* (a Chilean news magazine) concludes * * * as follows:

> In spite of the scant publicity which the "affaire" has received, in Latin America various conjectures are being spun about the discovery. It is being seen that many at times incomprehensible speeches made by President Johnson himself as well as by other American officials have a firm theoretical basis, translated into a well defined international policy which, with the passage of time, will be made concrete in very real measures tending to reinforce "tranquillity"—that is to say, North American superiority—in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

> In this way the North American and Brazilian pronouncement that now there are no national wars, only international ones, can eventuate in the death of the concept of sovereignty. The social sciences put at the service of intervention in the internal affairs of a country would do the rest.[3]

The writer of the article need not be so pessimistic-optimistic about the social sciences. American economists do not know how to halt inflation in Latin American countries. American political scientists do not know how to help Latin American governments collect taxes. American anthropologists do not know what to do about the swamping of Indian cultures by national communities. Few American psychologists know that Latin America exists outside the pages of the *Times* or the *Monitor*. American sociologists have no theory of social change adequate to explain Latin American cases. Social scientists working in the Government cannot protect the image of the United States in Latin American, and even the election pollsters have been surpassed by some of their Latin American colleagues.

Latin Americans can relax on the issue of the magical effectiveness of the social sciences. But when they say they can no longer accept individual American social scientists at face value, they are correct. The solution for Latin America, however, is not to close the doors to all foreign conducted or sponsored research and teaching. It is rather to insist upon clean credentials and academic competence—just as should we.

Scholarly competence and integrity

The statements I have made about what social science cannot do anywhere, let alone in Latin America, are not to be taken to mean that I think we are in a hopelessly low estate. To the contrary, we are increasingly masters of our disciplines; our grossest failures stem from our being willing to try what we are not peculiarly competent to do. The economists cannot effectively stop inflation in Latin America because some of the measures necessary to the task are political. Public administration men cannot make income tax collection easy because certain legitimacy and consensus patterns are necessary before the payment of such imposts becomes in large part a voluntary, individual act. The protection of certain segments of Indian culture before the tidal wave of national society is much more a function of ideological choice and public will than of anthropological writings about acculturation. To expect such macrosocial problems to submit themselves to mere social scientific manipulation, or to think that the policy advice of social scientists is magically efficacious is a denial of the statesman's art and a burdening of the social scientist with what he is incompetent to handle.

Under the very best of conditions, the social scientist can do the following for governments with his special skills:

a. He can generate and make available new data.

b. He can order these data to permit informed guessing about the nature of the lacunae.

c. He can indicate relevant theoretical patterns for the interpretation of the data.

d. He can—explaining himself carefully—indicate the probabilities of effectiveness of various selected courses of action.

---

[3] *Ercilla* July 7, 1966.

e. He can indicate which choices are foreclosed by the adoption of given courses of action.

f. He can indicate which new choices will be made available by the adoption of given courses of action.

Needless to say, very few if any scholarly documents submitted to any government have satisfied these difficult requirements. The temptation to take the easy path straight from description to prescription is great. But to go past these limits is to assume a vested interest in the ensuing policy itself, thereby rendering the scholar suspect in further objective analysis. Of course, I also continue to insist he is not peculiarly competent to make such value judgments. There is, however, always one overriding value decision that a social scientist must make; that is, whether he will lend his talents to any government seeking them. I should suggest that if the government asking assistance is likely to use its powers to restrict that very freedom of inquiry essential to the academic task, then the social scientist is committing professional suicide, not to speak of what else he may be helping to do to existing or possible democratic institutions.

The point I am seeking to underline is that the social scientist should be given deference only when he is working in the peculiar area of his competence. To the extent to which he is incompetent but pretends to competence, he fails of professional integrity. Most unhappily, incompetence has manifested itself not only when academicians get out of their fields, but even within them. Recent academic research and teaching by Americans in Latin America is heavily studded by examples of persons simply unequipped to do that to which they pretend. The Camelot fiasco, for example, could at least have been mitigated—if not totally avoided—if greater skill had been used in organization and administration. Professor Nutini's conduct in Chile is a lesson in how not to do such things; the inattention in Washington to timing and to other people's views is a product of faulty technique as well as insensitivity, and the carelessness in the wording of documents and their distribution reveals methodological innocence as well as contempt for one's research subjects. Once again, however, the Camelot directors are not alone.

On my recent visit to Chile I was asked if I, too, was "an exporter of data," a kind of academic copper company engaged in mining attitudes and carrying away the profits, never to be seen again in the country. Puzzled, I asked the why of the question. It seems that a very prestigious American professor, a faculty member of one of this country's most prestigious universities, had recently finished a study with the assistance of a local UNESCO agency. Asked to leave his code books and IBM cards, he refused, clearly wanting to publish before letting anyone else in on his act. My guess is that in the future he will certainly send the materials. But the reaction in Chile among local scholars as well as international civil servants was that this person had violated the essential conditions of his agreement as well as the canons of academic openness. This kind of misunderstanding is needless, and of course disturbs the work of everyone else. Unhappily, this particular professor had had no previous Latin American experience, and although he valiantly learned the language quite well, he still did not succeed in leaving the field clean after his departure so that his American colleagues would not be forced into easily avoided difficulties.

A full awareness of the terms of the responsibilties one accepts in a foreign area can also be included as part of the baggage of the competent scholar. Another internationally famous scholar, one of those allegedly named by Nutini as an adviser to Camelot dispatched a letter of denial to the Communist newspaper which had named him as a participant. In strict fact the letter was, of course, entirely honest. The trouble is that this person is working in Latin America supported by funds from other Government agencies. Because there is no secret about the matter, interested professionals throughout the area are fully aware of these financial ties. If his letter of denial was to be honest in broad as well as strict fact, should it not have mentioned this connection, and sought to inform Latin Americans as to the difference between, say, AID money and Department of Defense money for the social sciences? Certainly the difference between "clean" and "dirty" money, as the slang words go, is difficult enough for North Americans to determine. Why should Latin Americans be more aware and tolerant of the differences than anybody else? If social scientific research is to have a cumulative history in Latin America, instead of being the casual and accidental fruit of scholars of widely varying skills tapping funds which gush and dry up with the political seasons, then we had better start worrying immediately about the fate of our colleagues of the moment and of the future. The first step toward rebuilding the consciously extended confidence of Latin American scholars and governments is to be willing to reveal the sources of our funds, the premises of our studies, the nature of our data, and the bases of our conclusions. We should also make every effort to go beyond making data and findings available; we must help to make effective the ability of trained Latin Americans to use those materials, for clearly simple revelation is not enough. The skill to understand is also required.

The incrusted mistakes of a decade of amateurism are behind the disgust directed at Camelot. That 10-year period is the one of mounting U.S. interest in Latin American affairs, of an increasing flow of Fulbright scholars as well as otherwise highly trained and mature specialists, many of whom have not bothered to learn the specific conditions pertaining to Latin America. Some have never learned the requisite languages, hardly any one has studied the cultures in depth. How they expect to teach well or to analyze their data with subtlety, let alone design appropriate research instruments in the first instance, I cannot say. But now the entire world knows that their technical shortcomings have an effect beyond their articles and books: they prevent other articles and books from being written, they bring disrepute on American academic life in general, and they mislead policymakers thirsty for reliable information and imaginative analysis.

The most pathetic result, however, is political. Many independent but sympathetic Latin Americans who have been distinguishing between U.S. policy and other sectors of American life are now becoming convinced that they were wrong. In effect, they understand American scholars as refusing to accept the responsibilities of a plural, democratic society.

Competence, the academic world, and integrity

The academic slippage which has become so apparent in our Latin American activities is one of the possible (though not necessary) costs of a free and largely self-regulating academic community. As I have said before, truly professional research is the return legitimately to be expected by the society at large for respecting academic freedom. The full assumption of professional responsibility also involves projection and prediction in order to create a stock of ideas for future choice as well as to provide a test of present ideas. Institutionalized anticipation is the fruit of the relatively sanctionless risk-taking made possible by real academic freedom. Our present frenetic concern with "catching up" in Latin America is an unmistakable indication that American higher education, seen as a total institution, has not paid for its freedom by anticipating need in this respect, at least. The lack of ethical definition can also be taken as a failure to build into our several social science disciplines those standards which, carried by individuals, would have obviated the mistakes now a national concern in Latin America.

My point now transcends the individuals of whom I have been so far speaking, and poses the question of whether there has been a lack of integrity at the institutional level, the product of the failure to assume a patent obligation. For long it has been the conventional wisdom—repeated *ad nauseum* without ever an attempt at careful empirical demonstration—that the quality of Latin American studies is the lowest of all area scholarship. This judgment is clearly false for anthropology, history, and language and literature. How true is it for political science, one of the most maligned of the disciplines?

Merle Kling, in a devastating analysis of the shortcomings of American political scientists specializing in Latin America, writes:

> Little capital (funds, talent, or organizational experience) has been invested in political studies of Latin America, and as a result the returns have been relatively meager. Personnel with adequate training and appropriate technical competence have been in scarce supply, research techniques adapted to Latin American studies have been of a relatively primitive nature, and the level of productivity has been low. Political scientists conducting research on Latin America, like some landowners, have been reluctant to introduce advanced tools and machinery and to extend the intellectual acreage under cultivation—that is, to acquire new skills, to accept technical assistance, to encourage methods designed to diversify the crop of research findings, and to consider a redistribution of disciplinary properties. Political scientists specializing in Latin America have not reached, to borrow Rostow's familar metaphor, the takeoff stage * * *.[3]

Let us accept this evaluation just for the sake of argument. Is the prestige of this field so low because the practitioners are so poor? Or are the practitioners so poor because the prestige is so low? These factors certainly interact to ratify the continued existence of an unhappy situation. I am afraid that no beginning of an explanation of this phenomenon is possible without turning to the disagreeable question of academic stratification—the professorial class system, if you will. Here is a list of the universities having the 11 top prestige departments of political science, in order, chosen by a recent nationwide poll of political scientists.[4] I will add statements concerning their politics and Government professors who also are engaged in Latin American studies:

---

[3] "The State of Research on Latin America," in Charles Wagley, ed., *Social Science Research on Latin America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964) p. 168.

[4] Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus, "Trends in American Political Science: Some Analytical Notes," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. LVII, No. 4, December 1963, p. 938.

Harvard: None.
Yale: A junior professor with a Harvard degree.
California (Berk.): Junior professors in a state of turnover.
Chicago: No regular professor.
Princeton: None; hiring an Africanist for retooling.
Columbia: Nontenure associate professor.
Michigan: Nontenure junior professor; a long history of course offerings.
Wisconsin: Nontenure junior professor.
Stanford: Nontenure junior professor.
California (UCLA): Searching, using *ad hoc* professors.
Cornell: None. Searching.

In sum, there is not one senior professor of Latin American politics in any one of the major departments. If this list were to be published as of 10 years ago, we would find only two or three of these institutions even as far along the road as they are now. A little over half of all American doctorates in political science are produced by these departments; but, "Taking the latest (1962–63) faculty rosters, we find that perhaps 4 percent of the political scientists teaching at the leading 11 schools come from nonprestige institutions—and that these exceptions are found largely in the lower half of the group."[5] Aside from the basic academic question of whether Latin America offers any intrinsically important data for political science, ambitious students have not studied Latin American politics in the past because, among other possible reasons, it was simply impossible to do so in most of the academically politic institutions. Worse, top job opportunities were nonexistent. Thus the best Latin American offerings are generally in universities such as Texas and North Carolina which do not attract the best graduate students—or at least those destined for the prestige departments.

Kling, in the article to which I have already referred, states that few Latin American examples are used in comparative government texts. He is correct. But is his implication that it is the fault of the Latin Americanist correct? The evidence is that scholars outside of the area have not bothered to read what literature is available. Their absolute certainty that they are dealing with an intellectual desert is another element in the massive self-fulfilling prophecy of which we have been speaking. Let us take some examples. Because I shall have to cite, thus revealing names, I will quote only two persons both of whom have reputations so secure that nothing I might say could damage them.

Bibliographies and bibliographical articles would seem an apt place to look for an answer to the question of whether anybody is reading. Hans &. Morgenthau, in an article, "International Relations, 1960–64,"[6] assesses the current state of his field. Of 135 footnotes, 48 refer to specific countries or regions; two of this number are books on Latin America. "The literature on foreign policy," writes Professor Morgenthau in this section, "especially that of the United States, is of course, particularly abundant and unequal in quality. Here are some books which are likely to have a more than ephemeral importance." His Latin American listings are Adolf A. Berle, *Latin America: Diplomacy and Reality*, New York: Harper & Row, 1962; and Salvador de Madariaga, *Latin America Between the Eagle and the Bear*, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962. These choices are incredible, as I am sure the two authors would agree. The Berle book is a short and glittering statement of his personal appreciations of Latin America, suggestive of policy premises and applications. The Madariaga book does no credit to its author's distinguished life; it is an often inaccurate survey of Latin America, informed by a Hispanophile racism of no analytical value and in questionable taste. At least half a dozen journalistic surveys are much more reliable, better informed, and even better written.

---

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 937.

[6] *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, July 1965, pp. 166–171.

If Dr. Morgenthau wanted to cite just two or three books on inter-American policy, he might have mentioned such works as Bryce Wood, *The Making of the Good Neighbor Policy*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1961; J. Lloyd Mecham, *The United States and Inter-American Security: 1889–1960*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961; or perhaps even a historical work with contemporary relevance like Dana G. Munro, *Intervention and Dollar Diplomacy in the Caribbean, 1900–1921*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964. Certainly anyone taking Dr. Morgenthau's suggestions about Latin American readings would find his every prejudice about the field confirmed if he thought those two the best available.

Dr. Morgenthau is not alone in his disregard. For many years journals have listed Latin American materials out of alphabetical order, invariably at the end. Until the January 1964 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, for example, "Latin America and the Caribbean" was the last bibliographical entry. Since that issue, Latin America has moved into a section entitled "The Western Hemisphere," immediately following "The United States." Poor Africa has been relegated to the caboose. Alphabetical order may mean little. But when the Ford Foundation gets to Latin America only after Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, we have the operationalization of the *Foreign Affairs* bibliography.

Even when Latin America gets out of the book citation stage and into the analytical reference level, the specialist may feel it had been better neglected. Consider the following rather subtle reference by sociologist Edward Shils: "In Latin America, the armed forces historically have played a role similar to that of the military in many of the new states of Asia and Africa." [7] It may take a moment to recognize that that sentence is backwards, and should read, "In many of the new states of Asia and Africa, the armed forces are paying a role historically similar to that of the military in Latin America." After all, the Latin Americans have been at it since 1810, and the military of the "new states" only during the past 20 years. It is more than passing strange to attempt to draw a baseline from 20 years of historical experience when a variegated set of experiences in 20 Republics exists for periods of up to 155 years.

There is no need to belabor this point with multiple examples. I suggest merely that it is time for rigorous and realistic thinking about

---

[7] "The Military in the Political Development of the New States," in John J. Johnson, ed., *The Role of the Military in Underdeveloped Countries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962) p. 8.

Latin American studies, instead of the unprofessional surrender to stereotypes and status which has helped to hinder the growth of research as well as the reading and evaluation of what already exists.

The present state of emergency is a direct product of the insufficiencies of our major universities and scholars, just as it is of the persons in the field, as well as all the other factors I have mentioned. This background to the situation should not be neglected, lest we expend our expiatory energies in beating only on the scapegoat in Washington.

Some perspective

To put an analysis into perspective is all too often to dilute it with the tepid water of sweet reasonableness. If the chances are that the punishment for our academic sins will not be overly harsh, the reasons are implicit in the general conditions, and not in the promise of any dramatic change toward virtuous behavior. It is very probable that, after the passage of a little time, American social scientists will once again be able to work with relative ease in Latin America. Greater care will be taken to maintain respectable appearances on our side, Latin American social scientists and government officials will be more cautious in extending us their assistance, and that small part of the public which is informed will maintain a reserve affecting the nature of their participation in ways nobody will every measure. Camelot has dissolved, a few other projects sponsored by agencies of the Armed Forces will be canceled or camouflaged, and greater care will be exercised to inform American Ambassadors in Latin American countries of academic activities in their baliwicks. A foundation or two will sponsor meetings on the coordination of oversea projects and the proper nature of government-sponsored academic research. In a year from now, everything else being equal, an occasional wry remark will be heard at a cocktail party by way of memoriam.

Matters will follow this slow course because in neither Latin America nor the United States can radical change occur. The Latin Americans may extend their gaze to include a sharper perception of Europe, but they cannot blind themselves to the United States. The reasons are not by any means only political or economic. The enormous cultural weight of the United States in Latin America is a fact as obvious as the Andes. More pointedly, the contemporary revolution in the social sciences is a North American product, and whether Latin Americans go to Great Britain, France, Germany, or Italy, they will still return with one or another version of modern American social scientific empiricism. They can also put to good use foundation assistance and interchanges with American educational institutions. It is not that they could not get along somehow without us, but rather that most Latin American intellectuals—including highly nationalistic ones—would prefer not to be forced to so long as their continued collaboration with American scientific institutions does not imply a narrow political subservience. What Camelot surely has done is to speed the Latin American desire to diversify academic contacts. As there is already Soviet university work stirring in such countries as Chile and El Salvador, we may expect more elsewhere in the normal course of events. It is for the French and British, however, that major room will have to be made, a tendency being promoted for the past several years by the Department of State and American foundations as well as by some Latin American universities.

American reactions inside the universities will be even slower and more difficult to recognize. The reason is that professors and professorships cannot be made overnight, that good research takes time to produce, and that the decentralized nature of American higher education creates subtle eddies among the stimuli of communications, the sorting of responses, and the flexing of implementation. We may expect a bit more care in the foundation and some discussion, as I have said, but we shall still have to wait for the maturing of the current vastly expanded crop of scholars in training. We shall also have to wait for the social science "community" to attend seriously to the idea that there are ethical questions involved in policy studies, that ethics and technique are not to be separated under certain conditions, and that institutional snobbery is as testable for its validity as are election predictions.

For a while it was thought—and is still thought by some—that "retooling" was the answer to the problem of Latin American studies. All we had to do was take an expert from another field, let him turn the Cyclopean eye of his genius on Latin America, and the deficiencies of the field would rapidly be dissipated. The grotesque mistakes already made by some of these persons shows that, even in Latin American studies, the price of admission has to be paid. A highly trained specialist in Indian politics will find his Hindi—if he has any—of rather little use in Quito. And unless he is more theoretically gifted than most persons writing in the field of development, he will also find that his hypotheses may have little relevance to the only major underdeveloped part of the Western cultural world. It really will not do to have an internationally famous American scholar declare at an international meeting that it is a shame that there is so much more documentary material available on Africa than on Latin America. It really will not do to have as the only political scientist sitting on a major committee dispensing fellowships for Latin American studies an excellent scholar in another area who has never done research in Latin America, cannot speak either Spanish or Portuguese, and has so far made only academic touristic trips to the region. To be a violin virtuoso is not to be a pianist.

The reasons for a past lack of interest in Latin American politics are now fairly clear: the countries have little power; they pose—or until recently posed—no cold war threat; they are Catholic countries traditionally looked down on by Protestant ones; they have little prestige among the ivied universities who have followed the area leads of Oxbridge, the Sorbonne, and Berlin first into Africa, Egypt, the Middle East, and China, and then the realpolitik leads of international affairs into Soviet studies. I should like to suggest a reason now not for the lack of interest, but for the lack of success in most of what political research has been done. It is that Latin America is a very difficult area to fit into extant theory. The range of cases is immense: 20 different republics with increasingly different histories are also characterized by vastly varied internal conditions. We must study migratory Indians and megalopolis, village economies, and machine-tool industries, constitutional democracies, and populist falangisms and mercantilistic dictatorships, as well as village gerontocracies and institutionalized lawlessness. Latin America is the graveyard of simplistic and deterministic theories, of those schemes which hold that a nation which has "taken off" will automatically reach self-sustaining flight. It will not submit to simple notions derived without an adequate knowledge of the area's amazing store of data.

Let all who can revel in this potential richness. El Dorado can become real for the talented and dedicated social scientist. The mine will contain only fool's gold for the lazy and the self-seeking. But, as usual, the fool's gold will drive out the good metal if we are thoughtless enough to allow it currency in the marketplace. (*American Academic Ethics and Social Research Abroad*, American Universities Field Staff Report vol. XII, No. 3.)

Reflections After 3 Years in the Foreign Affairs Contract Research World

by William J. Nagle

In a talk to the International Studies Association meeting at Wayne State University on May 5, 1966, Mr. Nagle reflected on his experiences with foreign area research and the relations between government and academia. Mr. Nagle served both as director of the Office of External Research of the Department of State and as chairman of the interagency Foreign Area Research Coordination Group in Washington, D.C. He is now director of the Appalachia program, Department of Commerce.

Having departed the halls of diplomacy you will forgive me if I express myself first in a series of blunt statements:

1. Although I spent my 3 years at State in a sincere and sometimes spirited defense of our own and of other agencies' contract research programs, I must admit that there were very few of the more than 40 studies contracted during my tenure there that really proved very useful to the Department's policymakers or even to the Department's researchers.

2. Of those studies done by university scholars under contract to other foreign affairs agencies that I read, I would judge very few as proving useful to the operators.

3. More value was obtained for dollars spent in bringing in consultants on ad hoc problems than on studies done under contract.

4. Most of the studies were of high enough caliber that they could—as many eventually did—appear in scholarly journals, but few would have been found very relevant, even by other academicians, to pressing foreign policy problems.

5. The studies most useful from the viewpoint of the desk officer may have been judged least original and profound by the best of the researcher's academic peers.

6. Perhaps this is what Prof. George Taylor meant when he distinguished between the tools of scholarship used by a Government contractor and scholarship itself.

7. Most of the studies—whatever their acceptibility for academic journals—failed both as useful policy studies and as pioneer works expanding the horizons of their disciplines.

8. In short, in attempting to live in two worlds, most contract researchers whose products came across my desk failed to meet the standards and needs of the Government or the academy. The day I came to realize this was the day I began to worry that I, a contract research administrator, was in fact contributing very little either to the needs of Government or to the larger society's pursuit of knowledge and truth. It was about the same time, I suppose, that I began to wonder whether adjuncts to the contract program such as security clearances or hopes for future contracts might not be having an unhealthy effect

upon many American social scientists. And I wondered if security checks made them less willing to act as responsible critics of Government policy.

I should like to see more support by the Federal Government for basic social science research to be carried on by and where possible in the universities. I suspect under our present system of contract research—at least in the social sciences—the country has lost more than it has gained.

I am persuaded that we need new governmental structures to insure the necessary support of basic social science research. The present arrangements for support are not adequate. There is, I think, a greater realization of this fact in the Government research community than there is in the private research community. Much-needed projects in basic social science research will never receive the level of support they need if they must be justified in terms of the mission of an operating agency. As a basic social science research project on social change, Camelot should never have had to bear the burden of Army sponsorship under an operations umbrella of counterinsurgency. New and exciting projects—such as some of the simulation projects—should not at this early stage of their development bear the burden of proving themselves operationally useful. Basic research in the social sciences should not have to be supported in a bootleg fashion, or carried on in the middle of a California desert.

My personal view is that the National Science Foundation—given its present biases—is not now and is not likely to be in the near future an adequate source of funds for most of the disciplines in the social sciences. At the same time, I realize that social scientists need to work much harder than they have worked to provide a favorable base of public opinion and of support on Capitol Hill for something like a National Foundation in the Social Sciences. Until social scientists are willing and able to urge the same kind of fight that the physical scientists waged a decade and a half ago, they will continue to play a role as second-class citizens when it comes to Federal funds.

Meanwhile, I think it possible for Congress and the executive branch to devise some means—perhaps a Government-supported foreign affairs research institute, connected with no one operating agency, that might give grants for more general and more basic research that could be of benefit to both private and governmental elements interested in foreign affairs.

But a problem raised by James Reston in the May 1, 1966, New York Times gives me reason to pause even as I make this suggestion. The problem, writes Reston, "is that the leaders of America—not only in Government but in the universities, the churches, the big corporations, the newspapers, and the television networks—are so overwhelmed by the problem of doing things that they have little time left to think about what they are doing. Operations dominate purposes. The practical men have taken over from the ideological men, and this has many advantages, but pragmatism may be misleading us." And Reston goes on to quote a statement written by John Gardner while still president of the Carnegie Foundation:

> Very few of our most prominent people take a really large view of the leadership assignment. Most of them are simply tending the machinery of that part of society to which they belong. The machinery may be a great corporation or a great government agency or a great law practice or a great university. There people may tend it very well, indeed, but they are not pursuing a vision of what

the total society needs. They have not developed a strategy as to how it can be achieved and they're not moving to accomplish it.

This worries Reston, who thinks it is precisely the problem in the American Government today. It worries me, too.

And perhaps because I am still a bureaucrat, I realize how difficult it is for the pragmatists of government "to pursue a vision of what the total society needs." And, perhaps unfairly, I look to my colleagues in the universities to provide it.

And I suppose I think of this "larger vision" as so important that I wouldn't want the temptation of funds from a Government-funded Foreign Affairs Institute to distract my wise friends in academia to come down from their Olympian heights.

On the other hand, I haven't seen much lately that I could fairly describe as reflecting any "larger vision." Perhaps then I shouldn't worry about distracting my academic friends with contract money.

About midway through my 3 years tenure in the External Research Office, I thought it might be a good idea if some of the staff abstracted articles from the more serious periodicals on matters relevant to foreign policy. And I suppose I was particularly anxious to put into the hands of policymakers at State, Defense and other agencies articles that might be running counter to the "conventional wisdom"—perhaps even some reflecting the "larger vision" remarked by Gardner.

Our only criteria of selection were that they be written by responsible authors, that they appear in serious publications and that they be relevant. After a few months, we abandoned the program. I was surprised to find how little was being written that was relevant. And at least in those days there was very little appearing that even questioned the premises of some of our policies or the conventional wisdom or myths that dictated them.

In the past few months I have heard three Assistant Secretary-level people in three separate agencies—all men appointed by President Kennedy—decry this failure of the American intellectuals.

Last November, Defense's Deputy Assistant Secretary Arthur Barber devoted his whole speech to ISA's Washington regional chapter to "the failure of American intellectuals to contribute new ideas to American foreign policy." "I believe the potential for courageous, intelligent intellectuals concerned with political affairs * * *," he said, "has never been greater, but the response has been inadequate to the challenge."

Barber, in turn, quoted Dick Goodwin, who in his final speech before leaving the White House, said, "Nothing is more disheartening than the failure of much of the American intellectual community to evolve answers to the crisis of American public life."

Daniel P. Moynihan, one of the architects of domestic Great Society programs when he was Assistant Secretary of Labor, told me before leaving Washington how disappoinnted he was at the lack of ideas from the universities.

For my own part, I should like to see my colleagues given whatever no-strings-attached funds they need to stay in their universities to dream, to think, to act as intellectual gadflies in our society, to question the premises of governmental actions and programs and to work to attain for themselves and the rest of us that "larger vision" that is lacking. (Address, International Studies Association, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich., May 5, 1966.)

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The Foreign Student in America

by John F. Melby*

A former foreign service officer, Mr. Melby was director of foreign students, University of Pennsylvania.

In almost any American community with an institution of higher learning the foreign student has become fashionable. So fashionable, indeed, that the demands upon his time all too frequently threatens to or actually do impair his academic performance which is, after all, the primary reason he came to the United States. Americans are paying court to the foreign student for several obvious reasons, and some not so obvious.

Americans are by nature a friendly people. Our whole national experience and the high mobility of our society have taught us at firsthand what it means to be a stranger in a new community and how much difference a kind word can mean. Despite our seeming gregariousness, each of us knows the meaning of loneliness. Furthermore, Americans with their new and unsought world responsibilities have become painfully aware of how little they know about other peoples. The foreign student is one easy and usually pleasant way of making a dent in our ignorance.

If one suggests that foreign students have a direct relationship to U.S. foreign policy and that every American with whom they come in contact automatically plays some small role in the implementation of that foreign policy, the reaction of the "average" American is almost invariably one of immediate denial and even great embarrassment. How could anyone attribute to Americans such a "Machiavellian" motive for "playing host" to foreign students? In fact, however, can the foreign student escape from playing a significant role in international relations? And can the American who meets or knows him be other than a foreign policy "actor," for better or for worse? Let us first examine the American foreign student program that provokes this controversial question.

Although traditionally Americans studied in Europe—despite Mr. Jefferson's warning on the dangers of this practice—students in small numbers have always come to the United States as well. Perhaps the first one was Francisco de Miranda of Venezuela, one of the precursors of Latin American independence. And almost a century ago an awakening Japan sent about 50 students to Rutgers, which has ever since maintained a special interest in that country. Still, the foreign

---

*© 1964 Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.

student in America was something of a curiosity until the 20th century. And the present flood of students is a phenomenon of the post-World War II period.

The official figures[1] for this year will probably show that there are approximately 75,000 foreign students in the United States. In all likelihood, the actual number will be closer to 100,000.[2] They come from literally every country and political subdivision of the globe, and there is not a subject taught in this country which some foreign student is not studying somewhere. They are enrolled in at least 1,400 of our 2,000 institutions of higher learning. (Just how they manage to discover some of the more obscure schools remains a mystery.) Thus it is an unusual community or college student who does not know or at least have the opportunity to know an educated man or woman from another country.

About one-fifth of the foreign students are women; the average age is in the mid-twenties, and the length of stay in the United States is from 1 to 4 years. Ten percent are on U.S. Government scholarships, another 10 percent on foreign government scholarships, almost 30 percent on a combination of private scholarships, and self-support, and more than half are entirely on their own resources. The overwhelming majority of them will be members of the elite groups in their own countries when they return home.

Why do they come here? Basically, they come to get an education. It must seem ironic to them that American cities must mount massive campaigns to reduce the number of school dropouts when literally millions of foreign students would have come to the United States if they had possessed the funds and if we had been able to accommodate them. The desperate hunger of the underdeveloped world for education can be understood only by those who have personally experienced it. The rest of the world has for years known something Americans are only tardily beginning to appreciate, namely, that the fundamental resource of the world is people: there can be no meaningful economic growth, no decent standards of living without developing people. This requires education. A recent United Nations study showed that the battle for literacy is falling behind the rate of population growth. It is no accident, for example, that the struggle of the Negro for his rightful place in American society focuses so largely on education without which he is severely handicapped.

More specifically, the foreign student comes here for three reasons: In the first place, he believes he can get the type of training that will enhance his professional status at home. Secondly, all except the completely self-centered individuals believe this training will be of direct benefit to their countries. Thirdly, although this motive may be present only in the subconscious of many, they come to learn about and, hopefully, to understand the United States. An examination of these three points will provide a basis for evaluating the foreign student program.

---

[1] *Open Doors,* an annual publication of the Institute of International Education, gives foreign student statistics compiled on behalf of the U.S. Department of State.

[2] The smaller figure does not include several thousand trainees from the armed forces of other countries, many thousands of U.S. Government short-term trainees, official short-term visitors, or high school students under the auspices of the American Field Service or the American Friends Service Committee.

Are foreign students generally satisfied with their education in America? A study[3] done 3 years ago at the University of Pennsylvania showed that only 2 percent were dissatisfied, while well over 90 percent were quite satisfied. These figures are even more surprising in view of the large numbers of students from former European colonies who had been persuaded by their former masters of the basic inferiority of American education; many of them have come here only because they could not go to Europe and an American education was better than nothing. As the number of American-educated students returning home increases, this attitude is rapidly disappearing. Of the thousands of foreign students I have known, only one non-European with both an American and a European education thinks that the American variety is manifestly inferior—and he is a white South African of East European origin who plans to return to South Africa. There are many who quite rightly see advantages and disadvantages in both systems; this depends on the individual and the kind of training he wants.

It would be comforting if the question of academic satisfaction could be allowed to rest here. Unhappily, this is only the beginning of a troublesome and largely unsolved series of problems concerning the preferences of the students and the needs of the underdeveloped countries. Many fortunate foreign students, before coming to the United States or before returning home, know exactly what they will be doing when school days are over. For them the terminal months in America are mixed with a certain sadness at the ending of the experience of a lifetime as well as the excitement of returning home to fruitful and productive work. For just as many, however, the final year is marred by a growing anxiety. They worry not only about what kind of work they can find, but in many instances about whether they will find a job at all or how long it will take to find one. In a world crying for literacy and for skills, it seems paradoxical that the foreign student should be anxious about finding a job.

The years of experience which Americans have had with economic aid programs have slowly and painfully impressed upon us and upon the developing countries the fact that the proper utilization of skills is a very complicated business. The earlier and facile assumption that in a country short on technology any skill can be used and be useful is not only false, but it also leads to waste and frustration. At any point in a country's economic development, only a certain number of highly skilled persons can be profitably employed. Whereas the United States will probably never have enough Ph. D.'s, India cannot give employment to more than a limited number of Ph. D.'s until it has enough master mechanics, carpenters, bricklayers, and midwives to staff the base of the work force pyramid. Thus, some foreign students, returning home with an advanced degree, will not be able to find a job requiring a high degree of professional competence.

Presumably a graduate engineer should be able to operate a lathe, or a brain surgeon deliver a baby, if that is the best available outlet they can find to occupy their time. But it is not necessarily as simple as that. Conceivably, they might not be very good at these less exacting tasks, although better than the untrained person. Furthermore, it can be irreparably damaging and demoralizing for a man to work at a level considerably below his capacity and training; and it is a serious misuse of educated manpower in a world which cannot afford to waste this scarce human resource.

---

[3] John F. Melby and Elinor K. Wolf, *Looking Glass for Americans—A Study of the Foreign Students at the University of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: National Council on Asian Affairs, 1961).

The gnawing doubt is whether American technological training is what the underdeveloped countries really need most. Unfortunately, no comprehensive study on the subject has been made, but we do know that a substantial number of scientists and engineers from these countries go to great lengths to avoid returning home. Not all these expatriates are moved solely by higher wages and more comfortable living conditions, although some undoubtedly are. This group at least is using its skills—but now where these skills are most needed.

The doubt takes on a different kind of edge when we consider the other category of foreign students whose future is uncertain. Many foreign students are studying literature, music, art, archaeology or Sanskrit. Somehow, it is difficult to conceive of scholarship on Chaucer as having a very high priority among Ceylon's real needs, or the importance of a violin teacher for Korea. But what can one do about it?

There is probably no one solution. Rather it must come from a variety of self-restraints, each helping to ameliorate the problem. It should be emphasized at the outset that a nucleus of the finest skills must be available in each country, if for no other reason than to set local standards toward which others may aspire. Some governments with large needs and small resources regularly permit to go abroad only those students for whom there will be an important job and whose skills can be fully utilized. That a certain element of favoritism on occasion creeps into this selection is inevitable and, if within bounds, probably tolerable. Other governments, notably that of India for example, have taken the position that it is quintessential to a democracy that the individual should make his own choice—without interference from the state—as to what he will do with his life. This is a particularly difficult argument for an American to counter.

There is, in fact, probably no counterargument except that the individual who enjoys the privileges of a free society has some responsibility to that society which makes his freedom possible. India, when faced with a Chinese invasion, found it necessary to limit foreign exchange for students; the decision was made to provide this assistance to those students pursuing the more "practical" courses of study. No one seriously questioned the decision, not even some of the Indian students in the United States who were cut off and found themselves in financial straits. So far as the future of the Indian state is concerned, is there any important difference—except in degree of immediacy and dramatic impact—between the Chinese invasion and the possibility that the Indian economic experiment may not succeed? Would it not be wise for India to take into account the latter stark reality—as it did the former—to establish stricter criteria, based on India's developmental needs, for its support of students abroad and thus to reduce the "waste" of its precious foreign exchange? These are hard decisions to make and some of them will be mistakes, but the price of economic failure could be much higher.

The burden of making these difficult decisions should not be placed entirely on the already overburdened shoulders of the developing countries. The United States, which is paying a large part of the bill for development (although Americans could contribute more without feeling a financial pinch), should bear some of the inevitable onus of telling some students they cannot have the kind of education they want or as much of it as they are capable of acquiring. Should this onus fall on public or private American shoulders? In view of the pattern of freewheeling individual frenzy that we call American private and voluntary civic action and that by and large works better than anyone might expect, one is tempted to suggest that American private colleges and universities should assume this responsibility and should practice a little more discrimination in the admission of foreign students than they usually do. The real reason for these loose admission practices, which have driven more than one interested and dedicated academic adviser to the brink of isolationism, is that colleges often do not understand the problem and still quite properly feel they have an obligation to help where they can; hence they lean over backward to admit foreign students with questionable academic and personal qualifications. Nor is there any realistic reason why they should understand. It is one thing for Harvard with its Nigeria program or Montana with its Afghan program to know about these individual countries, but how can Slippery Rock State Teachers College or even the University of Chicago with their first students from Honduras and Cambodia be expected to understand? The dilemma puts us back, unfortunately, in the lap of that old bogeyman and whipping boy, the Federal Government.

What other institution is in a position to make the studies necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the foreign student program? Who else is in a position to evaluate foreign student credentials, on the basis of which colleges can make responsible decisions about admission? (Final decision to admit or reject must, of course, remain with the college.) Who else is in a position, by law, to discuss with other governments their real needs and resources? And who else has the legal authority to work out with other governments cooperative and self-restraining programs designed for the maximum benefit of all? The answer is that all these things are already being done and have had some effect, but they are done haphazardly, on too small a scale, and without an overall plan. The additional need could be met without anything really new or revolutionary; rather, by improving and coordinating existing practices.

This brings us to the third, and strictly nonacademic, reason why the foreign student comes here—to become better informed about America. It is for this reason that the foreign student is an important factor in U.S. foreign policy.

Almost all foreign students returning home after studying in America become members of their countries' growing elite groups. This is only natural, for they have received an education superior in most cases to that of their contemporaries who remained home; most of them must also have possessed greater initiative and energy to have ventured into a foreign land. The attitudes toward Americans which they take home will condition the attitudes of their fellow countrymen for many years to come, for they are the ones who have seen our country, lived with us, and formed firsthand opinions, however erroneous some may be, about America and Americans. In some instances, these opinions have already had a major impact. In some African countries where a president or cabinet minister over 35 is a rarity, many students were active in politics before they came to our shores; they report regularly to their leaders while they are here and all will most assuredly be active in politics as soon as they return. A few illustrations will suffice to show that this phenomenon—the entrance into political affairs in their own country of those young people who have studied in the United States—is neither rare nor insignificant.

The puppet president of the Philippines during the Japanese occupation, José Laurel, never made any secret of the fact that his distaste for Americans and his willingness to collaborate with Japan stemmed from his student days at Yale: he was courting a young lady in New Haven until her father bodily ejected him from the house with an unprintable epithet about the color of his skin. Nor is there much reason to doubt that some of the unfavorable attitudes of President Nkrumah toward the United States are related to unpleasant experiences at the University of Pennsylvania and in Philadelphia, the "City of Brotherly Love." Many foreign students today have serious reservations about American democracy when they not only witness but on occasion are directly affected by infringements of civil rights. If all these examples concern our race problem, it is only because this is the problem which most often leaves the greatest imprint on foreign students. But there are other shortcomings in American society—our slums, inadequate educational facilities, chaotic traffic, lack of urban renewal, and seeming irrationality in public life—which also amaze or disgust our student guests.

There is, of course, another side, much more representative of American society. The proverbial foundness and admiration of the Chinese for Americans before 1949 was based largely on personal friendships, mutual respect and warm human relationships, rather than attachment to the American dollar and commerce. Perhaps the single most important factor over the last 150 years is shaping American policy toward China has been the missionary movement. By the same token, it can be argued that the single most important factor in creating goodwill among the Chinese toward the United States was also the American missionary, and he did it mainly by sending Chinese students to the United States. Thousands of them returned to become leaders in their country. In the latter years of the Nationalist regime it was difficult to find an American in China who did not know a Chinese alumnus of his own almamater. These ties create personal relationships which should not be lightly dismissed.

It is worth recording here that the basic understanding of and friendliness toward Americans of men like the Governor General of Nigeria and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan can be traced, at least in part, to happy student experiences in the United States. These examples can be multiplied many times over. Even in the midst of our great civil rights debate of recent years, the American sense of fair play and the American social conscience have come to our rescue. Many foreign students witnessed the march of Negro and white Americans on Washington and the humiliation which most Americans felt when Federal troops had to be used to enroll one Negro student at the University of Mississippi. Such evidences of social justice did much to counteract skepticism about the American protestation that the rights and duties of our society belong to all citizens.

These attitudes are formed through experiences and contacts outside the classroom and laboratory: relationships with American students and relationships with the community. There is probably no part of his extracurricular experience which the foreign student enjoys more than getting to know "average" Americans off campus. The idea of taking a stranger into your home is alien to most other peoples and the foreign student is often at first puzzled or surprised. Once convinced of the genuine sentiment behind this unique American institution, he enjoys it.

To innumerable foreign students this kind of contact has made the difference between loneliness and a sense of warm acceptance. There is hardly an American community which does not now have a home hospitality program, and any foreign student who does not have an "American family"—or frequently several—probably does not want one. The community response to this challenge has been remarkable and in the best American tradition. Philadelphia has long been a pioneer in this field. The International House of Philadelphia, which handles the program for the area colleges and universities, has introduced something new in the last year or so. As soon as a student is admitted to a college in the area he is assigned a host family who writes to him before he leaves home, arranges to meet him on arrival, and often takes him home for a few days before classes start to help him get settled and accustomed to our way of life. To the average foreign student who arrives hot, tired, hungry, dirty, confused and wanting nothing quite so much as to get on the next plane and go home, a friendly welcome can make all the difference in the world. Most of these host families (those with young children seem to work best) probably never think of it, but each of them is playing a role in foreign affairs, as well as adding a new dimension to its life.

Far less encouraging is the foreign student's relationship with American students, and nothing disturbs him more. He has heard that Americans are friendly, informal, and approachable, and he finds that this is true, but often the relationship ends there. Close friendship does not follow and he is puzzled and a little hurt. It is not that the American is hostile; he is simply apathetic and preoccupied with his own concerns. As much as the foreign student appreciates his off-campus contacts, he wants to have even more friends among his contemporaries and professional colleagues. The American student, although he is usually not aware of this, plays a role in foreign policy just as his off-campus fellow citizens. Many campus foreign student advisers are concerned that the American student, on the average, is not playing this role as well as he could.

There are currently two approaches to foreign student work. One says in effect that there are no foreign students on campus, only students. The college provides the required routine immigration and legal services and perhaps special personal counseling; after that it is up to the student to make his own way. This may be adequate in a small school with half a dozen foreign students, but increasingly those in foreign student work are convinced that it is not enough. Americans are simply too busy to take on this new task without guidance and leadership. The community program did not just happen; it was organized and promoted.

The second approach is based on this realization. It holds that the successful integration of the foreign student into campus life must be carefully planned, so that he participates with American students in all the things Americans do. Furthermore, the student program must be an integral part of the international activities in which the university participates. It will not achieve maximum effectiveness if separated from the other international programs, whether academic or extracurricular. It is worth noting that the most fruitful progams are at institutions which subscribe to this approach; and, for whatever significance may be attached to this fact, most of the outstandingly successful programs are at state universities, such as the Universities of Michigan, Illinois, Texas and California. But it would be unfair to the American student to drop the matter here. I know from personal experience that many American students have found friendship with foreign students to be among their most cherished college experiences. They only needed to gain awareness of the opportunity for and importance of these contacts, and then they pursued them with interest and zest.

The foreign student, by virtue of his presence in America, becomes a factor in U.S. foreign policy—a factor over which the average American can wield considerable influence. There is every reason to believe that the foreign student will continue to come in spiraling numbers to America. If Americans believe that they have something to offer the rest of the world which will make it a better place in which to live, there can be no more effective channel of communication than the tens of thousands of young people who come eagerly to the United States because they too believe we have something to offer. We will fulfill their expectations and serve our own interests if we have prepared mutually beneficial foreign student programs.

In our own lifetime the world has become a village, and every man is neighbor to every other man. The foreign student in our midst is a talented and interesting neighbor who will soon return to assume his place among the elite of his society. It behooves Americans to remember that his experience and treatment in America will have an important bearing on his attitudes and actions and eventually on the policies of his country and on our own security and welfare. (*Orbis*. Spring 1964)

College and University Programs of Academic Exchange

by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy

The Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, established by the Institute of International Education in 1954 as a policy committee to survey the field of exchange, issued in 1960 a pamphlet designed to assist a college or university in analyzing its international education exchange activities. Each section—covering student, faculty, and short-term exchanges—posed the issues in question form in order to stimulate more detailed study by interested institutions.

All the potential benefits of academic exchange can be realized in some degree in the foreign student. He comes to the university to study and learn. He represents the challenge of an intellect to be developed. He is the scientist or scholar of the future. He may use his knowledge in the service of his country. His presence in the classroom helps to broaden the outlook of American students, and may stimulate faculty to reexamine teaching methods and curriculum. His presence on campus and in the community contributes to American understanding of other countries and to a lessening of American provincialism. His impressions of America help to clarify a fuzzy and sometimes distorted image of the United States. While the full value of having foreign students on campus is probably not being realized at present, the potential value is great.

What kind of academic program should be offered to foreign students? Does an American education meet the needs of all foreign students? Does it permit them to make a constructive contribution to their home countries? Many students from developing nations choose the United States as a place to study because they believe the American approach to education is practical. Many return home, however, to find that the knowledge they acquired in the United States has little to do with the immediate problems with which they must deal. In technical fields and the professions especially, the contrast between what they learn in America and what they can use immediately at home may be great.

To what extent should universities adjust their curricula and methods to meet the needs of students from developing countries? For most institutions, special courses are not feasible. The cost is too great, the needs to be met too numerous, and qualified teachers too few. Even if feasible, special courses tend to isolate students from the main stream of academic life and to lower academic standards. Special courses adversely affect recognition of U.S. degrees in many countries abroad. A university can, however, take other steps. It can improve its counseling of foreign students so that they find their way into the most appropriate courses available; it can permit greater flexibility in courses foreign students are allowed to take for credit;

it can encourage some students to take the courses they need without obtaining a degree. Some universities have set up special nondegree programs, usually subsidized by an outside agency, for groups of foreign students in a particular field. The more specialized the training sought by a foreign student, the more important it is that he attend an institution suitable for his purpose, whether in the United States or some other country.

Possibly we are asking too much of American education. The U.S. student who attends a university abroad, does not expect to receive an American-oriented education. He expects to learn those things which are unique and valuable in the foreign university system and culture. If the American university does its job well, the foreign students will take back knowledge and abilities that will be valuable in the long run. He may not be able to apply his knowledge immediately, but this is not necessarily the test of a successful education. Foreign students, like other students, need to learn many things the usefulness of which is not immediately apparent. The developing countries need competent specialists in professional and technical fields, but they also need men of insight, adaptability, and broad educational background to give direction to national development in the decades ahead.

Another major issue in this type of exchange concerns the scholastic performance of foreign students. Can foreign students be expected to do as well academically as American students? Should the "A" received by a foreign student be considered the equivalent of a "B" received by an American student? What limited evidence is available concerning the performance of foreign students seems to show that on the whole they do as well or better than other students, with the possible exception of work done during their first semester.[1] Where a foreign students does not do well academically it may be due, apart from inadequate preparation, to such factors as inability to express himself in English, difficulty in adjusting to a new environment, lack of familiarity with the American examination system, or personal problems which prevent him from concentrating on his studies. These are handicaps which the university can sometimes reduce. It can arrange special tutoring in English, provide personal counseling, allow the student a certain leeway in taking examinations, and help him compensate for his temporary handicap in other ways. Lowering the standard of performance for foreign students is not a solution. Granting of courtesy grades or a courtesy degree serves the interests of neither the institution nor of the student. It harms the reputation of American education abroad, encourages poor students to apply for admission to institutions, and postpones the day when the student himself must face reality.

How much assistance should the university give foreign students with their social and personal adjustment? Some say little or none. These people believe that the visitor should be expected to make his way in America without special reference to his foreign status.[2] Others say we must concern ourselves with the nonacademic adjustment of the foreign student, if only to equalize the difference between him and other students. Just as universities attempt to meet the special needs of American students for vocational counseling, reading clinics and programs for the gifted, these people argue that universities should meet the need of foreign students for intensive language study, advice on practical questions and personal counseling. It is this which the best of the campus programs for advising foreign students seeks to do. An Australian educator described the counseling services for foreign students at American universities as follows:

---

[1] Beals, Ralph L. and Norman D. Humphrey, *No Frontier to Learning*, University of Minnesota Press, 1957, p. 70; Du Bois, Cora, *Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1956, pp. 185–186; Hountras, Peter T., "Academic Probation Among Foreign Graduate Students," *School and Society*, Sept. 1, 1956; Koenig, Clara, "The Scholastic Performance of Foreign Students in the United States," *College and University*, January 1953; Maddox, James, *Mexican Study Abroad*, American Universities Field Staff, Jan. 7, 1957.

"The counseling services were described to me as much overdone, but the counselors whom I met were fine persons and wise men whose work was valuable and keenly appreciated, and who were alert to any risk of 'babying.' "[3]

Where the relationship between faculty and students is close, regardless of the size of the institution, foreign students often obtain the help they need from individual faculty members. In the past 10 years, however, most institutions have designated someone to act as foreign student adviser. The National Association of Foreign Student Advisers reports that some 600 colleges and universities now have such advisers. In 1954, 30 percent of them spent half or more of their time on foreign student affairs.[4] FSAs may themselves handle the whole range of financial, personal, intercultural, legal, and academic problems brought to them by foreign students, or they may direct students to appropriate offices. They may be responsible only for matters affecting foreign students, or they may coordinate all types of academic exchange programs. A number of institutions with large exchange programs have established central offices to handle all international programs but others prefer decentralized responsibility in this area.

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

1. Is the university attracting the kinds of foreign students it wants in a volume it can handle?
2. Should the university concentrate on foreign students from certain countries or areas of the world? On students in certain subjects or professional fields?
3. How does the university secure foreign students? Does the university present a clear picture of its facilities and resources to prospective foreign students? Should steps be taken to interpret the university more fully to students overseas?
4. In screening foreign applicants for admission, is the university making full use of available sources of information on the evaluation of foreign credentials?

---

[2] "Have we created the 'problem of the foreign student' more or less on purpose, in our own image? Have we, by adopting the running presumption that the foreign student *must* be a quivering mass of problems, encouraged a jungle-growth of a great, loose-jointed apparatus in this country which makes problems inevitable? Are we, as a country, by nurturing the proliferation of mechanisms which express our 'concern' pricing ourselves out of the foreign student market? Have we, by means of refining and perfecting our machinery for tinkering with foreign students, placed strains upon those students to which only the magnificently resilient are impervious, and from which the principal beneficiaries are the hopelessly non-self-sufficient among the foreign student population?" Du Bois, Cora, *Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States*, p. 32.

[3] Reynolds, J. H., "An Australian Views Higher Education," *American Oxonian*, January 1958.

[4] National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, *The Office of the Foreign Student Adviser*, 1954.

5. What should be university policy with regard to scholarships for foreign students? Should foreign students compete with American students, or should certain scholarships be earmarked for them?

6. How well are foreign students doing academically? Is there anything the university needs to do to help them improve their performance? Should the standard of performance be the same for foreign as for American students?

7. Is academic counseling effective in guiding foreign students into courses suited to their needs and interests?

8. Should any curricular adjustments be made for foreign students? Are specific course requirements for a degree the same as those for Americans?

9. Are facilities available for counseling foreign students on personal and practical problems? If a foreign student adviser has been appointed, does he have sufficient administrative support to carry out his responsiblities? Does he have faculty status?

10. Do foreign students have opportunities to meet and associate informally with American students? With American families? What role should the university play in arranging such contacts?

11. Has the university made adequate provision for:

Obtaining and screening applications of foreign students?

Evaluating foreign student credentials?

Checking the nonacademic qualifications of foreign students: language competence, personality, health, and financial support?

Offering supplementary English language training to foreign students who need it?

Helping foreign students orient themselves to the university and to life in America?

Providing guidance on government regulation affecting foreign students?

Introducing foreign students to American students and the local community?

Helping foreign students find housing accommodations?

Insuring foreign students against illness or accident?

Offering scholarship assistance to foreign students?

Offering emergency financial assistance?

Arranging part-time employment?

12. Are foreign students recognized and used as an educational resource? Are they considered for teaching assistantships in foreign language and other departments? Are they asked to meet occasionally with history, geography, world politics, and other classes?

13. Should foreign students be served by the alumni program of the university? (*College and University Programs of Academic Exchange.*)

The Foreign Student Adviser and His Institution in International Student Exchange

by Ivan Putman, Jr.

Mr. Putman, director of the Office of International Faculty and Student Exchange, State University of New York, Oyster Bay, N.Y., prepared a Handbook for Foreign Student Advisers, a sectionalized introduction to the history of student exchange, the philosophy of international student exchange, and the responsibilities which the educational institution and its foreign student adviser undertake when foreign students are enrolled.

With the perspective of 10 years of active postwar participation in student exchanges between the United States and other nations, the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy (CEIP) based at the Institute of International Education in 1955 issued an important statement on the goals of international exchange. They asked the question "Whose goals?" and pointed out that the goals of the exchange student from abroad may be quite different from the goals of the United States in welcoming him to our shores.[1] The CEIP identified major goals of sponsoring groups in the United States which finance foreign students in this country and of the individual foreign student. It has since become apparent that the goals of the U.S. educational institution and of the student's home country are also important factors in the situation.

The foreign student's goals.—The first four of these are paraphrased from the CEIP statements. All of these goals in greater or lesser degree are factors in the motivation of the individual who comes to the United States for study.

1. To obtain education which will advance his own status and prospects, often education not available at home. This is unquestionably his major purpose.
2. To acquire knowledge and skills needed for the development of his country.
3. To make a contribution to the advancement of knowledge through cooperative study and research with scholars in the United States.
4. To promote international understanding through informing Americans about his country and learning about the United States.
5. To enjoy an exciting and stimulating trip abroad and the social prestige that such an experience often brings among one's associates upon his return home—the "grand tour" idea of an earlier day.
6. To escape from a difficult situation at home—political, economic, or some other.

---

[1] Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, *The Goals of Student Exchange* (New York: Institute of International Education, 1955), pp. 4–5.

7. To enjoy the general educational advantage, the broadening of ideas and horizons, and the sharper insights and perspectives in viewing one's own culture which may be gained from living in another culture.

His country's goals.—At the same time that the student pursues his personal goals, his government and others in his country concerned with his coming may have these objectives in some degree:

1. To acquire as quickly as possible technically trained individuals who can help more effectively in solving the country's economic, educational, health, and political problems.
2. To establish a beachhead of influence and good will in the United States in the hope of promoting more economic, technical, and military aid.
3. To promote mutual understanding and cooperation between the two countries.
4. To enable an individual citizen to improve himself as much as possible for his own good, and secondarily for the country's benefit.

Sometimes the student's country may be completely indifferent to his going abroad or to using his education and skills upon his return, or it may be openly antagonistic to his going and to employing him upon his return.

The goals of the United States.—Objectives of the U.S. Government, national sponsoring agencies, the public at large, and communities in which the students live are likely to be these in some degree:

1. To foster understanding of and friendship for the United States, and thereby contribute to world peace.
2. To educate the foreign student so that he can return to his own country to make a contribution toward its development.
3. To develop outstanding leaders in their professions and their countries.
4. To enjoy a touch of the exotic—native costumes, songs, dance, and the like.
5. To meet needs for trained personnel in this country, even on a temporary basis.
6. To contribute to the advancement of knowledge throughout the world for the general benefit of mankind.
7. To make converts and develop missionaries abroad for our political, economic, and/or religious philosophy.
8. To provide helpful contacts for U.S. business abroad.

The goals of the U.S. educational institution.—Both the general goals of the institution and specific goals with respect to international education apply to the foreign student:

1. To foster the general advancement of knowledge for its own sake and for the benefit of mankind.
2. To help each individual through education achieve his fullest potential.
3. To increase international understanding both through scholarly effort and through association in an international community of scholars.
4. To contribute to the development of other nations through the education of their students.
5. To enhance the international dimension of the education of U.S. students and the U.S. community in general through close

association with foreign students, and by using foreign students as resources for appropriate classes, club programs, etc.

6. To fulfill the obligation to cooperate with the U.S. Government and other influential national agencies in achieving their international goals.

7. To help fill staff needs from student assistant and graduate research assistant to professor and research scholar which are difficult to meet from U.S. sources.

There is nothing new in any of the four lists, although some of the items are not always stated so explicitly. While the order and relative importance of the goals within each set might vary, and while in a particular situation some of these goals would not apply at all and some others might need to be added, these generalizations seem valid from comparing the several lists:

1. The education of the foreign students is very high on all four lists. The educational experience is central to the whole enterprise, and it must be successful if any other purpose is to be realized for any of the interested parties.
2. Each list contains a mixture of altruistic and self-interest motives.
3. There may well be conflict among the paramount interests of the student, his sponsor, his country, the United States, and the college or university.

Even with the recognition of the centrality of the individual's educational gains and of possible conflicts among goals of the interested parties, probably the greatest hazard in the whole enterprise is the assumption, so naively held by so many, that all of these outcomes will be achieved automatically just by having foreign students here. The transfer of more than 80,000 human beings, as of 1964–65, from other countries across our borders and into our colleges and universities gives us 80,000 chances, but it tells us nothing about the odds.

When we consider what a foreign student faces in coming to the United States, we marvel that he ever succeeds. He packs himself up and leaves home, perhaps for the first time. He travels often thousands of miles with considerable physical discomfort. He arrives in a bewildering American city with keen anticipation, only to be confronted with confusing and frustrating entry procedures. He is shaken by the discovery that he can neither understand nor be understood, in spite of what he thought was an excellent command of English. He arrives on the campus and may have trouble finding housing he can afford or in which he will be accepted. He may find that there are humiliating questions about the quality of his previous study at home, and confusion about whether he should really be classified at the level he expected. He probably has to go through yet another English examination and a registration process that seems chaotic. The academic system may be completely different from anything he has experienced, with much less freedom in many respects, and much more taken for granted in others. At one possible extreme the spectre of failure in his courses may haunt him, or at the other he may find them disappointingly elementary. He may either be ignored or feel that he is on exhibit as an exotic curiosity. He is shocked to discover how expensive things are in America. He may find he is short of money and that the reputation of the United States for wealth and generosity has led him into unrealistic expectations. The food may not agree with him; the people may seem indifferent or downright unfriendly and the social customs strange and illogical. Finally, he is likely to go through one or more periods of acute homesickness. We can only admire his courage and marvel that his study abroad is successful.

An amazingly high percentage of these exchanges do succeed in achieving some of the expected goals. They don't succeed automatically, but rather for two good reasons: (1) the high calibre of the foreign students, and (2) the careful planning, sympathetic interest, and dedicated work of people concerned at every step in the exchange process: staff of the Cultural Affairs Office and U.S. Library in the student's home city, the International Student Service port reception staff, the foreign student adviser, the teacher of English as a foreign language, the community program leader and host family, student and faculty leaders on the campus, and the American roommate and friend. It takes much effort and patience on the part of the exchangee and of those responsible for and interested in him if he is to make the adjustment, solve the problems that confront him, conclude his educational experience successfully, return home, and through the experience reach fulfillment of his goals. (*The Foreign Student Adviser and His Institution in International Student Exchange.*)

The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?

a report of The EWA Study Committee on Foreign Student Affairs

Continuing concern for the responsibilities of U.S. colleges and universities in the education of foreign students led Education and World Affairs in the autumn of 1963 to set up a Study Committee on Foreign Student Affairs, intended to focus attention on those responsibilities. The committee was chaired by Ralph W. Tyler, director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Palo Alto, Calif.; Maurice Harari, vice president of Education and World Affairs, served as study director. The committee's report, under the title "The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?" was published in 1964.

An African student wishing to study medicine in the United States and to obtain his medical degree within 5 years discovered to his consternation on the eve of embarking that he had to undergo 3 years of training in the liberal arts before entering medical school. A college in the Unitied States uncritically accepted a translation by a foreign student certifying that he had passed second in a class of 300. Later, an accurate translation from the exotic language in which the initial document was written revealed that his rank was closer to the bottom of his class than to the top. A dark-skinned Asian girl learned upon her arrival that the American college which had admitted her was segregated and in her disappointment attempted suicide.

Many foreign students of adequate intellectual quality drop out of college within a few months of their arrival here because they are inadequately prepared in the English language to keep up in their courses. Many foreign students are unsuccessful because they lack the educational background or the motivation required by the program or the university in which they enroll. Others are misled or mislead themselves into coming to U.S. institutions of higher learning with expectations that cannot be fulfilled either by themselves or the institutions involved. Still others have inadequate financial resources to cover their needs, and this compounds their educational difficulties.

Foreign student programs involve other problems in addition to those encountered on American campuses. Fellowship programs financed by separate agencies of the U.S. Government often compete for the same individuals overseas, to the confusion of indigenous students and leaders alike. Many foreign students become alienated from their native cultures and arrange to stay permanently in the United States, although their skills are desperately needed in their home countries. Some return but find little or no opportunity to employ their U.S. training—either because it is not sufficiently adaptable to their indigenous environment or because no provision is made in the home country for their employment in the field in which they were prepared.

These examples are illustrative of the difficulties arising from the rapid growth of foreign students, a growth which has not been anticipated by many colleges and universities. Furthermore, the rapid expansion in the numbers of American students seeking admission to college is raising questions regarding the continued increase in the foreign student enrollment. In some States, the legislatures have acted to restrict the admission to State universities of out-of-State students. Some colleges and universities are now asking the kind of questions about foreign student affairs that can only be answered adequately through individual institutional evaluations cast in the context of the total U.S. relationship to the various foreign areas. In this broader setting, our educational institutions are trying to place in clearer perspective their efforts in the foreign student field. Despite the real successes and achievements of American educational institutions in foreign student affairs, the leaders in colleges and universities sense that they have reached a critical juncture where more planning and less laissez-faire are called for. These leaders are voicing concern about the issues arising from the presence of foreign students in unprecedented numbers. This report, written primarily from the standpoint of U.S. colleges and universities, attempts to bring some of these issues into focus.

The number of foreign students presently in the United States approximates 75,000, some 75 percent coming from the emerging areas.[1] Our foreign student population has doubled in the last decade, and there are many indications that it will double again within the next decade. The quantitive problem is compounded by the anticipated influx of qualified Americans who will be seeking a higher education in the next few years. The sheer numbers add urgency to a host of other foreign student problems that are pressing on us, of which the following are but a sample: Are our foreign students being well selected? Are reasonably high admission standards being maintained? Are foreign students coming at the right stage in their educational careers? Are they being properly placed? Are they being properly oriented to the English language and to American customs, institutions, and values? Are they receiving training that has sufficient applicability in their home environment? Are they receiving adequate counseling and guidance while in the United States? Do they, in fact, return at the completion of their studies? Are they able to contribute their newly acquired skills to the development of their nations? Do our colleges and universities bear an unjust portion of the financial burden for the training of foreign students?

There is ground for concern in all of these areas. This report cannot attempt to provide answers to all the important questions. Because of the complexity of foreign student problems and the time limitations under which we have operated, and because of specific proposals and requests put before us for consideration, we concentrate in this report on the problem of preadmission procedures overseas. But as a result of our inquiries and deliberations we also identify a number of related issues that warrant further careful study.

Why foreign students

There is no doubt that foreign students make substantial demands on our staff and financial resources. A number of educators who have considerable experience with foreign student problems estimate that about a third of the students from underdeveloped areas do not have sufficient command of the English language upon arrival in the United States to enable them to grasp the substance of the regular lectures in undergraduate or graduate courses. Foreign students also require orientation to the U.S. way of life and to the rules and procedures of U.S. educational institutions. Bypassing preparation is likely to result in additional strains on our faculty and administrative personnel as well as in personal dissatisfaction on the part of the students themselves. Also, because of the cultural shock often affecting students from the emerging areas, personal counseling above and beyond that normally available to American students frequently appears to be advisable. On the financial side, many foreign students come to the United States with insufficient funds to enable them to reach their immediate educational objectives. Since they must maintain status as full-time students during the regular academic year or forfeit renewal of their student visas, frequent financial crises arise with which the host institutions must deal.

---

[1] Figures from *Open Doors 1964* (New York: Institute of International Education).

Since the admission of foreign students to our educational institutions requires greater investment in staff and increased financial resources, our institutions need to be clear about their reasons for admitting foreign students. At present this clarity is rarely found. Policymakers within the same institution often differ sharply over the role of their institution in relation to foreign students. Few boards of trustees give consideration to this topic. It is not surprising, then, that foreign student policies followed by many American colleges and universities are ambiguous and conflicting.

However, current discussions among educational leaders show that there is continuing strong support for the admission of foreign students. Several arguments are presented, which usually fall under one or more of the following four headings:

1. *Cold war cultural diplomacy.*—This approach involves the belief that training foreign students here is a way of making friends for the United States in the cold war. At least some of those foreign students who do not attend U.S. or Western European universities receive training at educational institutions of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

2. *Education of the most promising individuals in the world community.*—According to this approach, resources for higher education should be devoted to providing opportunities for education and professional development to the most promising individuals regardless of their country of origin. American colleges and universities having unusual resources bear special responsibilities to provide such educational opportunities.

3. *U.S. responsibility to assist the underdeveloped areas.*—This approach is based upon humanitarian and political considerations. We should help underdeveloped societies develop themselves. It is the moral responsibility of the advanced and rich nations, such as the United States, to help train the nationals of the underdeveloped areas.

4. *Cultural interaction.*—This approach stresses the value for American students of cultural interaction with foreign students. Particularly at the undergraduate level, interest in foreign areas, cultures, politics, and ways of life is thought to be stimulated by the presence and contribution of foreign students.

In quest of a plan

A rigid rationale for the presence of every foreign student would not be in keeping with the pluralistic and heterogeneous character of American higher education. Diversity, flexibility, and calculated risks are necessary. But while uniformity of attitudes on the part of our colleges and universities cannot be expected and would not be desirable, the time is more than ripe for each institution to develop a rationale for its involvement with foreign students consistent with its own educational goals. Only if there is explicit planning at the institutional level can there be assurance that both the institution and the foreign student will profit from the student's presence.

An institution that regards its foreign students as a mere appendage or an exotic exhibit is doing justice to neither itself nor its students, American or foreign. The selection, admission, and programing for foreign students in an institution of higher learning should be explicitly congruent with the basic purposes of that institution. The planned presence of carefully screened foreign students and their adequate training should constitute an integral part of the educational strategy of the college or the university. Only when an educational institution has formulated its own rationale for the presence of foreign students is it likely to make the most effective use of its limited resources in their behalf.

In planning its admission policies each college and university needs to take into account a number of factors which vary from institution to institution. Some of the relevant factors are these: (1) the size of the institution; (2) its private or public status; (3) its graduate or undergraduate character; (4) its fields of specialization; (5) its substantive geographic concentration on some part of the world through multidisciplinary programs, research projects, or other activities; (6) its overseas involvement through exchange programs, government contracts, interuniversity and other arrangements.

Pluralism and cooperative planning

Despite the diversity which characterizes our institutions of higher learning, they are confronted with an imposing array of common issues in the field of foreign student affairs. Some facets of the complex challenge cannot be met adequately without the careful exploration of cooperative approaches among institutions within each region of the United States. Promising illustrations of such cooperative planning are afforded by ASPAU (the African scholarship program of American universities), which is concerned with the admission and training of African undergraduates, and by BASIS (the Boston area student international seminar), a program started in the summer of 1963 under the auspices of five institutions in the Boston area to provide orientation and other services to foreign students in that area. The interinstitutional approach may involve collaboration on foreign student programs by a regional group of colleges or the two-way relationship of colleges in a region with a major university as a nucleus.

The need for more explicit planning on the part of individual institutions is hardly controversial. Cooperative planning beyond the single campus inevitably raises more complicated issues because of the overlapping and sometimes competitive involvement of many organizations and agencies, each with distinctive interests, objectives, and sensitivities. Is cooperative planning possible in such a pluralistic context? Or can we afford *not* to attempt more orderly approaches to foreign student problems than presently prevail?

RESPONSIBILITIES OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

We have just recommended that each college and university involved in the education of foreign students develop a clear statement of its purposes and individual plans. We have also recommended cooperative planning among higher educational institutions with common interests.

But effort must also be made to reduce the confusion and conflict in the activities of government and private agencies responsible for support and operation of programs overseas.

Cooperative planning

Despite the contributions of our governmental agencies and foundations, our resources are very limited in the face of gigantic needs overseas. The challenge is how to preserve the pluralism of American higher education, yet avoid the chaos, confusion, and rivalry overseas that has arisen in the absence of effective cooperative planning. The need for coordinated approaches abroad on the part of universities, government agencies, foundations, and other private organizations involves a much wider range of concerns than those included in the handling of foreign students. How to attain a higher degree of coordination warrants continued study on the part of the major institutions and agencies concerned with education in the emerging countries. While enforced coordination or the total elimination of competition among these groups would be politically unfeasible and intrinsically undesirable, mechanisms and devoted effort are needed to attain a greater degree of exchange of information and cooperation than presently exists among those actively involved overseas—especially those effectively financed by U.S. Government funds. Insofar as foreign student programs are concerned, a higher level of cooperation is urgently needed.

Responsibility for the sponsored student

Particularly undesirable are competing programs initiated directly by different Government agencies and aimed at foreign nationals in the same emerging areas. Other conflicts and rivalries among major private agencies that services overseas—such as selecting, recruiting, or supporting foreign students—have resulted in part from the lack of communication and understanding among governmental agencies from which these private agencies derive financial support. A sustained interagency appraisal of current Government-sponsored scholarship programs in terms of purpose and of operational handling overseas should prove useful.

Several of the common goals of sponsored programs of foreign study can be met only if the sponsor, public or private, extends his responsibility to include facilitating the foreign student's return home upon completion of his educational objective and following up the student's success or failure in putting his newly-acquired talents to use in his own country. Such continuing assessment of the aftermath of foreign study seems essential if sponsored programs for foreign students are to attain maximal effectiveness.

We have also heard the argument put persuasively that governmental and private sponsors of foreign study should take increased initiative in the exchange of information and in possible cooperation with foreign governmental and nongovernmental authorities in some of the countries whose students present special problems to the United States—for example, poor selection or preparation or propensity to remain in the United States indefinitely. Such cooperation, though it could contribute importantly to more rational programing, should not be allowed to result in denying admission or fellowships to qualified applicants from ethnic, religious, or political minorities of a foreign country. Private sponsors may be able to maintain more flexibility in this regard than agencies of the U.S. Government.

Responsibility for the unsponsored student

Foreign students sponsored by various Federal agencies account for about 10 percent of all our foregin students. With the passage of the Fulbright-Hays legislation (Public Law 256) in September 1961, the principle was recognized that the Federal Government has an interest in what happens to the unsponsored foreign student. The recognition by the U.S. Congress of the need to provide at least minimum necessary services to the 90 percent of the foreign students in the United States who do not come under U.S. Government sponsorship was long overdue. Current programs relating to foreign students funded under this legislation include the field service program of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), which attempts through consultants, workshops, in-service training grants, and other methods to assist U.S. colleges and universities in raising their level of services to foreign students. But in the 3 years since the passage of the Fulbright-Hays legislation authorizing support, only minimal funds have actually been appropriated for all programs for the unsponsored foreign student. The first annual allocation (for fiscal year 1963) under this authority was only $748,755 and was reduced to $394,000 and $395,000 in fiscal years 1964 and 1965, respectively. The categories of activities to be covered by these funds include: (1) Improvement of selection, placement, and overseas counseling, (2) orientation and language instruction, (3) strengthening of campus programs, (4) summer work and study programs, (5) financial assistance for students in the United States, and (6) strengthening of community programs. Because of the failure of Congress to appropriate more adequate funds for these activities, the board of directors of NAFSA adopted the following resolution:

> *Whereas* Public Law 256 (Fullbright-Hays) recognizes in the international educational exchanges a broad national interest and responsibility; and *whereas* the expression of that interest and responsibility in the form of financial and other support for urgently needed services to foreign students has been minimal; and *whereas* the rapid growth in the population of both American and foreign students in our institutions of higher learning is causing critical problems and making even more important the adequate fulfillment of the national interest and responsibility asserted in Public Law 256; and *whereas* the recently released report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs calls attention to the fact that "testimony is almost universal that the program as a whole has been under financed:"

Be it Resolved: that the Board of Directors of the NAFSA strongly supports action by the Executive and the Congress of the U.S. Government to fulfill more adequately the national interest and responsibility with respect to foreign students generally and the implementation of the Fulbright-Hays Act specifically, and that this position of support be brought to the attention of all concerned.[2]

The frequent problems arising from the unplanned flow of unsponsored students might also be somewhat mitigated if the Federal Government were to make greater efforts than it presently does to encourage students—both those who wish to come to the United States and those who return from study abroad. Conditions imposed locally on students who seek overseas training differ markedly from country to country. At one extreme there are the countries which show no interest in how many of their nationals leave or return. At the opposite extreme are countries in which currency restrictions and preferences for certain fields of study are used to provide strict control over students leaving for study abroad.

Between these two extremes, there are many ways in which American higher education, in cooperation with foreign governments and agencies, could work more effectively than it now does. Specifically, American institutions can help in evaluating the need for overseas training of foreign students; they can recommend which kinds of training may be most indicated; they can offer guidance in the development of student selection and training programs; and they can advise on the admission and placement of students in U.S. colleges and universities.

Such cooperation of governmental and nongovernmental authorities would promote the better use of skills acquired in the United States by these foreign nationals and minimize the so-called nonreturnee problem. The latter is sufficiently important and complex to warrant comment.

The plaint of those responsible for the support and administration of foreign study is that many foreign students fail to return to their countries of origin. Exchange becomes a covert channel for immigration, and those objectives of educational exchange that depend on the student's return are subverted. It is indeed distressing to note that as many as 40 percent of all the students from a certain Asian country stay permanently in the United States under one scheme or another.

It has been argued that the Federal Government has the means and responsibility to reduce the seriousness of the nonreturnee problem through a review of existing regulations as well as through cooperation with foreign governments. While this may be true to a degree, the nonreturnee problem is more complex than such a proposed remedy suggests. The problem is often discussed in terms of the student's alienation from his home society as a result of his experiences abroad. In an appreciable number of instances, however, conditions in the home country force a realistically low expectation that hard-earned skills, whether acquired abroad or in home institutions of higher learning, can be put to rewarding use. The problem may then lie not in the student's alienation or seduction from his home country, but in the closed-opportunity structure or the inefficient social provision for the use of trained people, however badly they may be needed for social and economic development. Because of the complexity of the issues underlying nonreturn or nonutilization, a policy-oriented study of these issues would be most valuable and might well suggest other ways of coping with the problem than those now available to the Federal Government.

---

[2] As cited in *NAFSA Newsletter*, XV, 8 (April 15, 1964), page 13.

PROBLEMS OF ADMISSION

Assessing the foreign applicant

Many of our colleges and universities are experiencing difficulty in selecting foreign students for admission. At the root of the problem is insufficient information on which to base evaluation of the applicants and of the foreign educational establishments from which they come. The lax admission policies of some U.S. educational institutions further complicate the picture. The I-20 form issued by a U.S. institution is almost exclusively the basis on which U.S. consular authorities issue a visa to a foreign student. In the issuing of an I-20 form the educational institution effectively grants the prospective foreign student entry into the United States. It becomes therefore, *a matter of national interest that the admitting institution have adequate means of assessing the background and potential of its prospective students so that it can use its admission privileges wisely.*

It is the prerogative of the admitting institution to set its own admission requirements. An institution may in fact lower its requirements in specific cases for nationals of newly emerging nations with limited educational facilities. It may be fully justified in so doing if (1) it has the amount and kind of information on which to base judgment of the educational potential of applicants and (2) it has access to the remedial aid necessary to raise the students' competence to a level commensurate with the institution's educational requirements. Several institutions do make such allowances for gaps in substantive training and for lack of fluency in the English language.[3] There is, however, a serious concern, on the one hand, lest the apparent competence or lack of competence of the candidate in English be allowed to weigh too heavily in the decision to admit or not to admit the candidate, and on the other, lest adequate remedial work not be available to make it possible for the candidate to reach a level of English proficiency whereby he can fully benefit from his educational experience in this country.

Flagrant abuses presently exist in the exercise of admission privileges by some U.S. educational institutions. We encounter reports, for example, that many foreign students who have been rejected by institutions in their own countries because of low quality and potential have been admitted to the United States only to drift aimlessly from one institution to another. Unfortunately, a few American colleges catering to foreign students are tantamount to residential diploma mills which profit from the naiveté of the foreign applicant and bring unqualified students to the United States to encounter certain disappointment and to create problems for the other institutions to which they may drift. In general, the lowering of standards of admission apparently places the U.S. faculty members in the perennial dilemma of having to decide whether to grant the so-called foreign student C or foreign student M.A. instead of a failing mark or the denial of a diploma. There is a strong consensus among those most closely involved in foreign student affairs that faculty members who practice a double standard to enable inadequately achieving foreign students to pass through academic hurdles are doing high-quality foreign students a grave injustice, and also injuring the world reputation of American higher education. Insistence on reasonably high standards for admission, administered with appropriate flexibility, should substantially reduce pressure for giving these unfortunate charitable passes. *The receiving institution has the primary responsibility for admitting only those foreign students who are likely to succeed in their educational pursuits.*

---

[3] We note with great interest the introduction in February 1964 of the test of English as a foreign language (TOEFL) initiated by the National Council on the Testing of English as a Foreign Language with the assistance of a $250,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. An evaluation of the degree of success of TOEFL in the next 2 or 3 years is eagerly awaited by many who regard the creation of this test as a landmark in the field of testing of foreign students.

In addition to satisfying itself with the background and caliber of the candidate, the admitting institution needs to make sure that the foreign candidate has a reasonable understanding of what the institution can offer him. Many foreign students reportedly discover soon after arrival that the institution they came to attend has a very weak department, or sometimes no department at all, in the field in which they expected to specialize. *Better guidance overseas and a more reliable flow of information between the prospective students and the institutions they propose to attend should alleviate this problem.*

The difficulties that result from admitting foreign students with insufficient qualifications for successful performance in the United States are clear and costly. But even in cases where sufficient and accurate information is available on which to evaluate the applicant appropriately, there are certain additional considerations that complicate the attempt to set up criteria for admission of foreign students.

The undergraduate

At the undergraduate level, the value to American students and the larger U.S. community of cultural interaction with students from other countries[4] should perhaps be a major criterion for deciding which and how many foreign students should be received on an American campus. Another major consideration should probably be the degree of difficulty students have in obtaining adequate undergraduate education in their home countries.

It is on the foregoing premises that some educators question the advisability of having received in the United States all of the 36,000 undergraduates who are presently here. They maintain that many of these students could have pursued their undergraduate studies profitably in their home countries to the benefit of their indigenous educational institutions, at a lesser financial cost to the United States and to themselves and with less chance of permanent alienation from their home country.

Those who maintain these views are nonetheless quick to add that it is beneficial to the American undergraduate and to the college community in general to be exposed to knowledgeable foreign students, and that the foreign students can often widen the American student's horizons by arousing his interest in a foreign culture and way of life. These educators concur that cultural interaction is an important component of a liberal education and justifies the presence of numerous foreign students on every undergraduate campus.

---

[4] This role should not become excessive. It is reported that a number of foreign students are encouraged to engage in so many extracurricular activities beyond their own campus that they become inadvertently "exploited" and distracted from the major study goal for which they came.

They also recognize that there are countries in the world, particularly in Africa where indigenous educational institutions do not exist or do not have the facilities to train their students in certain undergraduate fields, and that in such cases American colleges have a responsibility to make their resources available. But the proponents of these views do not see much justification for the relatively indiscriminate admission by U.S. institutions of several thousand undergraduates who are able to attend good undergraduate institutions in their home countries or who have been rejected by these local institutions because of inadequate achievement. They advocate, therefore, the exercise of greater selectivity in admitting foreign undergraduates. With the increasing number of foreign graduate students, a more careful selection of undergraduates would probably not reduce the total number of foreign students coming here.

A further argument advanced by those who favor greater selectivity of undergraduates is related to the total U.S. effort in strengthening overseas educational institutions. Inasmuch as the U.S. Government and American foundations are actively engaged in the creation and strengthening of educational institutions in the underdeveloped areas, the concern is expressed that our colleges may be inadevertently hampering these efforts through indiscriminate admission of students from these areas without sufficient regard for the opportunities for higher education already existing or in process of development in these countries.

Another issue, referring to the manpower priorities of the underdeveloped areas, needs to be dealt with here in relation to the undergraduate, although it is also part of the problem of graduate admission. It is argued by some that admissions should not be exclusively tied to manpower priorities. Such a rigid policy would rule out gifted individuals from developing their talents in a variety of fields, such as philosophy and the arts, that may not be high in a developing nation's scheme of priorities. Concern is expressed, nevertheless, about the large number of students from abroad who train themselves in fields for which they have no special calling and whose training does not seem to render them eligible for positions upon returning. Without the imposition of a rigid choice of fields upon the applicant, a healthier balance than is the case at present could very likely be attained if the applicant received information about manpower priorities and educational opportunities in his own country as well as accurate information about the type of training he could receive in the United States or elsewhere. *These considerations speak strongly in favor of the presence in the underdeveloped areas of qualified spokesmen for American higher education*—spokesmen who are simultaneously qualified to advise on U.S. colleges and universities, knowledgeable about indigenous educational opportunities and developments, and alert to the specific long-term social and economic forces which determine so profoundly the priority needs of the several emerging nations. This subject is discussed later in this report.

The graduate

Many of the problems involved in the admission of graduate students are similar to those with undergraduates. Because graduate students are older and their work more specialized, the emphasis upon cultural interaction is less than for the undergraduate. Because graduate instruction is very costly, it is particularly important to avoid drawing many graduate students from areas where good graduate programs are available in the fields they have chosen.

The issue of manpower priorities is likely to be more acute in graduate and professional education than in the undergraduate education. Costs are higher, resources are more limited, and the needs of developing countries are more sharply defined in the specialized fields. But this raises questions about the particular programs available in the American university. The graduate school must consider not only the availability of a place for the foreign applicant in the particular field for which he is applying but also the relevance of the program to the applicant's purpose. It is frequently found that the graduate and professional training given foreign students is unrealistic in terms of the conditions they encounter when they return to their home country. For example, in some cases the equipment they have learned to use is not available. In others, the level of development of the art or science makes other knowledge more necessary than that gained in the United States.

The graduate school must also ask whether the foreign graduate applicant has the requisite qualifications to succeed in the particular program for which he has applied. A judgment on this question must be made on the basis of evidence different from that provided by American applicants. Finally, the graduate school must seriously ask itself: Does the admission of the candidate fit in with the overall plans of the university in its international activities?

Raising these questions is not meant to suggest that a graduate school should apply criteria rigidly in deciding on the admission of foreign students. But these are the kinds of questions to be considered in arriving at reasoned decisions. An institution may decide, for example, not to consider the manpower needs of foreign countries on the ground that fellowship programs initiated by the foundations and government agencies are likely to give this factor primary weight. But, as with the admission of undergraduate foreign students, the decisions should be guided by a clearly planned institutional policy. Furthermore, in order to make wise judgments, the admission officers need dependable information and knowledge. They are greatly aided by having the opportunity through travel and seminars to gain firsthand experience with the educational standards and trends in the underdeveloped areas. This is helpful both in making judgments about individual students and in developing appropriate policies and procedures.

The right students at the right institutions in the right numbers

The distribution of foreign students among U.S. educational institutions is considered by some to be one of the critical problems in foreign student affairs. Some 25 percent of all foreign undergraduates are clustered in 32 of our universities which also have 62 percent of all foreign graduates studying in the United States. The workshop on the admission of foreign graduate students, which was held in

Chicago on February 28–29, 1964,[5] deplored the fact that large numbers of foreign graduate students were concentrated in relatively few institutions and expressed the feeling that an effort should be made to achieve a more equitable distribution.

The issue is much more complex than it would appear offhand. While the current concentration of over 1,000 foreign students in each of nine institutions can be explained in part by the prestige of these institutions, the variety of offerings, and in many instances the quality and depth of work in special areas, such concentrations of foreign students seem to create special problems in orientation, guidance, assimilation, and housing. Where large numbers of foreign students from the same country or region are present in the same institution, there seems to be a tendency on the part of these students to isolate themselves from the general student body and the community. There are those who maintain that clustering is unfortunate because foreign students in large groups at large universities and colleges are not likely to get the degree of attention which they might receive at one of the smaller institutions with fewer students. At the opposite end of the scale, however, the question has been raised as to whether some of the 1,800 institutions with small numbers of foreign students have the offerings, facilities, or academic and community environment conducive to effective education of the foreign students these institutions accept.

There are still others who say the issue is one of placement or "misplacement" rather than of clustering, and hold that many of our foreign students would best be placed in junior colleges or vocational technical schools rather than in the 4-year liberal arts colleges. It is argued that as a result of their performance in junior colleges, many foreign students could then more wisely be encouraged to proceed to higher educational levels or to return home to work.

It may be that a clearinghouse service would be useful to assure the suitable placement of qualified foreign students initially rejected by one or more U.S. institutions because of shortage of space. Perhaps information and service agencies overseas as well as in the United States should deliberately encourage foreign students to seek entrance in other than the few institutions where the overwhelming majority of foreign students seem to concentrate at present. *It is obvious that the problem of clustering, whether of a particular national group or of foreign students in general, warrants a careful study of its implications for the receiving institutions as well as for the foreign students themselves. The results of such a study would be invaluable in the future planning of our educational institutions.* If, as some suggest, clustering is undesirable and if the conditions that make it undesirable are identified, cooperative means and mechanisms could then be considered to effect a better spread and placement of foreign students in U.S. educational institutions.

The migratory foreign student

Once in the United States, a great many foreign students immediately start proceedings to move to other educational institutions in the country. In some cases the reasons for such a move are legitimate, but in other cases *a change could be avoided if the admitting institution*

---

[5] Held at the Palmer House, under the sponsorship of the College Entrance Examination Board and the Institute of International Education.

exercised greater care in assessing the foreign student's expectations and its own ability to deliver. It should also be noted that a large number of inadequately achieving candidates overseas learn from their fellow nationals with experience in the United States that they can secure admission to some of our lesser known educational institutions which exercise unduly liberal admission policies. This pattern has produced highly undesirable results. Many of these students arrive in the United States without much desire or intent to work seriously or to stay in the institutions which have initially admitted them. Some students end up drifting from one institution to another or performing so badly that they find it difficult to maintain student status anywhere. The entire question of graduate foreign students who transfer from institution to institution was recently discussed at the workshop on the admission of foreign graduate students, which finally passed the following resolution:

> That the view of the workshop, that no U.S. graduate school should admit a student who had obtained his visa on an I-20 issued by another school unless the applicant had completed one year (or at least one semester) at that institution, be communicated to the Council of Graduate Schools, the Association of Graduate Schools, the various associations of graduate deans, AACRAO, and other appropriate bodies. (*The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?*)

Foreign Students: Exchange or Immigration?

by Gregory Henderson

Mr. Henderson, research associate at the Harvard University Center for International Affairs, served in the Foreign Service of the U.S. Department of State from 1947 to 1964. During the period when he was cultural attaché of the U.S. Embassy in Seoul, Korea, he participated in establishing the first student exchange program with that country.

Talk of the "brain drain" of English scientists to American institutions has been much heard. Sometimes, the impression given is that all drain comes from England. In fact, the most serious drain is that from underdeveloped countries and there is every prospect that it will now increase. A new bill, H.R. 7700, lies now before the House. It seeks to revise an immigration quota system admittedly antiquated. It contains many improvements. Its central feature is the reduction by 20 percent each year for 4 years of the present annual quota for each area and the addition of these quota numbers to an overall reserve distributable to countries whose demand for emigration has not been met. Up to 50 percent of such distributed numbers may go to "qualified quota immigrants capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States."

This change sounds most reasonable. Yet it will greatly increase the already painful draining away to ourselves of the very skills needed by the emerging nations in order to better themselves. For prominent among the nations whose quotas have until now been insufficient are those very lesser developed nations we have sought to aid. Addedly painful has been the fact that this drainage has, up to the present, been serious but has been effected under the beneficient name of "international exchange."

Firm facts on the nonreturn of foreign students are almost impossible to obtain. The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service keeps information on those converting to permanent residence but does not break its statistics down by nationality. It acknowledges, however, that "student immigrants" are numerous, especially from Asia. Many other institutions concerned with exchange are distressed about the problem but have not given it voice and action.

Silence and obscurity notwithstanding, many emerging countries, notably several important ones, are having great difficulties getting their students home. State Department sources say that the rate of return of Chinese students from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Chinese minorities in southeast Asia, who numbered 5,410 at the end of the 1963–64 academic year, probably runs no higher than 5 to 7 percent, if that high. Especially few of the 3,057 from Taiwan itself return. China has for years been one of the three largest contributors of foreign students to the United States. A rate of approximately this percentage on a figure of this dimension, maintained as it generally has been for some 15 years, means that perhaps tens of thousands of Chinese students have settled in the United States permanently; some 2,000 became permanent residents in the year ending June 30, 1963. The loss of the Chinese mainland has, of course, seriously curtailed their professional opportunities. Yet I have observed important jobs in Taiwan crying to be filled, while former Chinese students, now fully trained in these fields, were holding down lucrative employment in American industry.

Korea, for years one of the top seven providers of students, has sent, according to a recent American-Korean Foundation report, "almost 8,000" students to the United States since 1946, of whom an estimated 800 have returned to Korea. Some 2,411 Koreans are listed by the Institute of International Education as still in student status in 1964. Some 4,800 Korean students would thus appear to be nonreturnees. Upward of 800 have been "adjusted" in the last 2 years alone. Informal indications show that this low return rate is currently falling still further. Indeed, the wholesale importation of the students' families from Korea is now increasing.

Iran, long one of the five or six largest student contributors, with 2,824 students listed by IIE, has also suffered severe difficulties. The Embassy of Iran, whose concern has led to the maintenance of a special student office, informally admits that the actual number of its students here is much larger than 2,824—probably twice as many or more. One experienced cultural attaché at a Near Eastern embassy in Washington said before a recent conference on development: "Of Iran's 6,000 students in this country, only 50 percent are returning." A similar percentage of Lebanon's 800 students or recent students stay here permanently. The problem has for decades concerned India, second largest foreign student contributor, as well as the Philippines (particularly in regard to medical interns and residents, of which it is the world's largest contributor to U.S. hospitals: 1,687), Pakistan, Egypt, Colombia, Argentina, Ecuador, Greece, Jordan, and to a lesser but still painful degree, many others.

The challenge of drain has, of course, evoked some response. Many concerned nations have tried one technique after another to curb the flow, but their embassies have been frustrated. A foreign government can put no stamp in a student passport which will prevent him from settling in the United States, and there are cases in which even removing the passport or ending its validity have not availed. Persuasion is usually equally unsuccessful. The lure of the dollar and research programs is greater. Sedulous in preventing "unfair competition" among ourselves, we place no restraint on our efforts to bid with all our resources against less fortunate nations for their own citizens.

Even without the added incentive of relaxed immigration, the future promises increase, not control, of this process. We are now inheriting from Vietnam the problem of her expatriate intellectuals which was once France's. As revolutions and coups overthrow more of Africa's new regimes and those of other countries, more students will wish to remain in the United States. Our intention to help emerging nations will be increasingly compromised. Our Government's left hand is heedless of its right. We give aid to China, Korea, India, and Iran with the one and take their best-trained men away with the other. Our universities do no better than the Government. Students of development decry our failures to help emerging nations successfully; their colleagues sign on foreign technical assistants; the foreign student adviser bewails the nonreturn of training to the lands it should help. There are few universities, great or small, that do not share in this pattern. Many other institutions and individuals have become caught up in it. A recent poll among international developers conducted by Paul Hoffman estimates that 10 percent or less of the potential human resources of emerging nations is being utilized.

The situation is especially serious with foreign scientists. The Yugoslav scientist, Dr. Steven Dedijer, has recently observed that between 15 and 30 of the 120 countries of the world, with less than one-third of its population, possess practically all its science, spending 95 percent of the world's research and development funds and reaping most of the benefits therefrom. Some 100 of the world's nations have "either in an absolute or in a relative but very significant sense, no science." The problem of development is linked to that of indigenous science. Since many of these underdeveloped countries are in effect exporting what scientific skills they possess to the United States, the problem of scientific underdevelopment is closely coupled with the nonreturning student problem. Ironically, many students from emerging nations enter science in the United States not in order to raise the levels of their own science-starved countries, but because they know from experience that such training leads to job offers and permanent status. Scientific studies have, in other words, become for many a device not for development but for immigration. Figures recently published by UNESCO show that during the 12 years from 1949 through 1961, 43,000 scientists and engineers, or an average of 3,350 a year, immigrated to the United States. Many of these came from underdeveloped countries. Recent statistics likewise show 1,556 engineers, 213 chemists, 47 biologists, and 21 physicists from South America alone working permanently in the United States.

I vividly remember the first electrical engineers we in the U.S. embassy in Korea considered for study in the United States in 1949. One ended up at Westinghouse, another at General Electric; a third, whom we did not send, is now a Columbia professor. They have since been joined here by several dozen more. Our aid program has to make up for them. Americans with no better engineering training than these Korean graduates, but speaking no Korean, devoid of either knowledge of or interest in Korea or its culture, are sent to advise USAID's electrical projects in Korea. They receive high salaries, live behind barbed wire, subsist on artificial PX and commissary support, and last all of 2 or 3 years. The same could be said of the programs in many other countries. Congress complains of the costs but contributes to them by passing such bills as H.R. 7700 and Public Law 37-885 of October 24, 1962, allowing thousands of such trained foreigners to remain permanently here. If we could figure the value of what we and our Congress thus remove from development, it would run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

The medical situation is worse. Dr. Ward Darley in the *Journal of the National Medical Association* has observed: "In the years from

1950 to 1960 almost 10,000, approximately 12 percent of the country's licentiates in medicine, were trained in foreign medical schools." He also states: "In 1960, 1,400 foreign-trained physicians were added, or 18 percent of the total number of licentiates for that year."

Though all these entered under visitor exchange visas and were thus constrained to leave the United States for at least 2 years after a maximum period of 5 years of study, the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization between 1958 and 1963 gave 3,636 waivers permitting them to remain in the United States. Dr. H. Van Zile Hyde, former Chief of the Division of International Health of the U.S. Public Health Service, observes that under the education and exchange program, other countries in effect maintain the equivalent of three medical schools to satisfy U.S. domestic medical care demands. In 1961, the United States absorbed into its permanent medical structure almost one-third of the medical graduates of that year from Greece. There are more American-trained Iranian doctors in New York than in all of Iran. Korea, where more than one-half of all sections of the country have not a single doctor with modern medical training, provides 20 anesthesiologists for the staff of one east coast American hospital alone. Filipinos, Turks, Indians—all less healthy than we—must delay advances in their own health standards because we use their resources.

These losses do not stop with health and engineering. The intellectuals we take are the people whose presence, withdrawn from homes, neighborhoods, shops, voting booths, newspaper columns, clubs, and tearooms in their own lands, deprive us of the communication that the societies of the emerging nations so desperately need with the more developed world. More than our own citizens, these should be the communicants within those lands of the experience of America and of democratic life, in a depth and variety that only those who have lived in the United States for years—not foreigners traveling through, or Americans expressing U.S.-born thoughts abroad in a foreign tongue—can impart.

The causes and the cure for this problem are complex. Only a few ideas can be ventured here.

First among these is *honesty*. If, after every consideration, we still feel that, in an imperfect world, we have reason to seek an immigration program which attracts the trained men of emerging nations, let us have one. But let us argue for it openly; let us call it by its correct name, issue immigrant visas for it, and administer it as such. Let us stop concealing an immigration program under our student and international exchange programs. The pending immigration bill, at least, does fulfill this minimal requirement.

Next, we can insist that our own Immigration and Naturalization Service provide us with full statistics on each country's nationals entering since 1946 on student or exchange visitor visas and tell us what has happened to them—or at least, to their visa status.

Programs in countries which consistently export students instead of training them can be tightened or, if improvement is not made, eliminated except in special cases. Permits to stay for *practical training* following graduation can and should be signed by the respective employer or, if their present widespread abuse is not stopped, eliminated entirely. More emphasis may have to be put on training students abroad rather than here. Entrance requirements for the foreign student should be raised. When requests for prolongation of study for advanced degrees are made, universities should ask for evidence on how such training at that level will be used in the student's home country. Finally, admissions should be more and more restricted to foreigners above the undergraduate level so that the lures to stay in America will be countered by a maturer mind better grounded in his own home culture. In the process, we shall have to examine our own educational system and ask why it appears to be failing to prepare foreigners for the problems they will face on return. If we want to be a teacher for the world, we shall have to prepare students for more than our own conditions.

More important and far more complex are the positive things we should do to help our foreign graduates win the important places they deserve in the development of their own countries. The intractability of the problems they face does not allow us simply to tell them to "go home," nor would doing so be within our best traditions. We cannot even assume that such graduates, unaided, can always find their own jobs and care for themselves. If we consider our foreign graduates' assets for economic development, which is also in our interest, then we should enter the new territory of helping them even after their return. We are not weaponless for this. AID has scarcely started to work on this problem. We set up institutes overseas; we have educational influence, both public and private, and we have great influence through our AID programs, which we have responsibility to administer with efficiency. We also have money and may, eventually, have to consider *return scholarships*. If increasing numbers of specialists from such countries immigrate, we could consider a special Peace Corps effort additional to that we now have to utilize their services for 2 or 3 years in their native countries.

Human happiness and freedom of choice should not be forgotten. It should, instead, be extended rather than parceled out to a few individuals. Millions are longing to break the bonds of their own poverty and frustration, not just the suppliant before our desks. He chose freely, and his choice was to enter not for permanent, but for temporary purpose. For all our sakes, he should stick to that choice.

None of this is easy, nor will it solve all problems. Hopefully it will alleviate a near-scandalous situation. International and interorganizational effort will be needed to solve it. Foreign embassies, foreign student advisers, the Institute of International Education, the exchange program of the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the American Medical Association, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the foreign student associations, the Human Resources Staff of AID, and even the Peace Corps could place their resources behind solutions. They should be—and will be—sympathetic to the foreign student caught in the mysterious tides which rip between advanced and emerging nations. Our intention is not to be stern, for the foreign student's job is one of the hardest of the modern world. Our aim should be to help him serve his own lands profitably and with full pride. If we so approach the task we will find cooperation.

Our belief in the peaceful development of the emerging nation demands both understanding and self-discipline. Our immigration situation and the bill now pending increase the force of the question that we must ask ourselves: Is this belief great enough for us to sacrifice the vested interests we seem to be acquiring in retaining the foreign student? And our foreign graduates have a question to ask themselves: Is their belief great enough to inspire a recommitment to their own land? (*Nafsa News Letter*, November 15, 1964.)

*Foreign Aid and the Brain Drain**

by James A. Perkins

Mr. Perkins, formerly vice president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, is president of Cornell University.

There is . . . conflict between the objectives of our foreign assistance programs and the requirements of our expanding economy—between our efforts to train people in the less developed countries and our drain of foreign specialists to fill important jobs here in the United States.

In the developing countries we are concerned, of course, with increasing the pool of modern men with modern skills and modern attitudes so central to the prospects for those nations. But on the domestic front our need for these same skills has led us to enact immigration laws that actually encourage the importation of these same men and women. It is possible that we are draining off this precious talent faster than we are helping to create it? Is it a serious problem? Can anything be done about it—or is it just one of the macabre ironies that illustrate the Biblical prediction, "That unto every one which hath shall be given; and for him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him"? . . .

The answers in foreign assistance have never been simple, and they become no simpler the more we learn. Surely the business of assisting in the modernization of a traditional society is far from perfected. But we have made several discoveries in the last 15 years. We now realize that societies and nations are all in different stages of development. We know that every country must have savings for capital development and that foreign assistance is almost a necessity for those too poor to save in adequate amounts. We have also found that social structure may be a barrier to the release of developing energies. One of the most important things we have learned is that investment in capital equipment is not the single magic lever that, once provided and pulled, starts an unending cycle of growth. The machinery—political and social, as well as economic—neither tends nor reproduces itself. The pivotal force around which any modernization process must move is talented, skilled, developed man.

This lesson has been increasingly the theme of students of the development process. The Ashby Report on higher education in Nigeria was a landmark in its emphasis on trained manpower and the education system required to produce it. The interest of some of our economists—Lewis, Mason, Schultz, Harbison, Ward, and Galbraith—is bringing a new level of sophistication to the subject of manpower development. In the social field there have been important contributions by anthropologists, such as Cornell's Holmberg, Sharp, Opler, and Leighton, who have spent 15 years studying the impediments to devel-

---

*Reprinted by special permission of *Foreign Affairs*, July 1966. Copyright by the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., New York.

opment imbedded in the customs and taboos of those whose modernization we would further. And the work of such men as Beeby, Curle, and Havighurst, analyzing the problems of literacy, secondary education, university reform, and adult education, has become crucial in assessing the role of education in the making of modern man.

As we have had experience with the development of man from a primitive, tribal state to integration in a complex, advanced society—a process that many of us have observed in a single lifetime—we have learned several things about his attitudes and the factors that influence him along the way. It is important to the subject at hand that we look more closely at this evolution, so that we can better understand what a fragile process it is and how precious is the man who emerges from it.

The first thing we must make clear is that men vary as much in their development as societies do. Just as societies are strung out along the chain of advancement, reaching from the economic and social levels of the Upper Volta and Brazil to Japan and the United States, so are men distributed along an arc that ranges from unquestioning primitives to the restless, driving managers of advanced technological enterprise. And just as it is possible to describe with some accuracy the levels of economic development, it is possible to identify certain stages of human development.

One strong caveat to this analysis should be recorded at the outset. It is not assumed here that the members of any given society fall into clear-cut categories. There are many ways, as Kalman Silvert has pointed out, of "mingling structural with value factors"—a task I will leave the reader to work out with Professor Silvert. The skills and attitudes conducive to modernization vary within a society. This is as true in the most highly developed nation-state as in the most backward and isolated village. We all know that in our own nation talent is distributed throughout the whole social structure; that high IQ is not solely the prerogative of the economically privileged; and even that any one man can be modern in some respects, traditional in others, and in still others ruthlessly and shockingly primitive.

Bearing this caution in mind, let us examine the characteristics and social evolution of modernizing man.

Surely this evolution must start with the desire for change. The man who never questions the status quo, who believes that his destiny is inevitably controlled by fate or the natural world, who commits himself to the faithful repetition of habits of work and patterns of life his ancestor knew—such a man, at whatever end of the economic spectrum he may be found, cannot assist or contribute to the modernizing of his world. A man capable of change must be prepared to abandon the past as a guide to the present and to replace acceptance with dissatisfaction, even though the path ahead may be unclear.

This first big step in human development must be nourished by exposure to change. And here education, mobility and visible example can be potent forces indeed. The education that gives young people skills can also give them a sense of new-found powers and leave them impatient with the ways of their fathers and the primitive life of bush, village or *favela*. Literacy opens up still other avenues of communications that can bring in visions of the world outside. Sometimes there may be a radio or a television set to stimulate the imagination.

The new mobility can also bring change. The peasant who travels to the city market may find his route changed by a new road and the city transformed by a new airport. He is confronted with cars, machines, people in strange dress, and he returns with unfulfilled desires and comparisons for his own life. He may do nothing more about them than to chew an extra supply of narcotic leaves—but he may also decide that his son had better go to school.

A pervasive influence to which the whole emerging world has been and will increasingly be subjected is the example set by the outsider—the foreign missionary, the military man and the businessman, and now the Peace Corps worker and the consultant. For good or ill, these people are in direct contact with those in a traditional society who would learn not only specific skills but new attitudes toward work and improvement. The example the outsider sets may stimulate or jar, but it can be a vigorous force for change.

Not everyone is exposed to change, nor does the exposure always affect everyone the same way. But those who do respond are ready for stage 2—the stimulation of desire for improvement. Dissatisfaction with the status quo is not enough by itself to lead man toward a constructive social goal. He must have hope fed by achievement. The man exposed to a bit of city life, educated enough to real the newspaper and understand the national radio broadcasts, and touched by envy of status and power, can as easily sink back into apathy or drift aimlessly through life as he can step up the ladder of social change. The difference is concrete accomplishment, however small, and the prospect for more accomplishment. His larger hopes must be encouraged by the realization of his smaller ones as he moves toward that well-publicized revolution of rising expectations.

The third stage, granted to those who have survived the incentives of the second, comes when man begins to look at himself as an individual, with unique talents and particular needs to express them. At this stage he is indeed prepared to make the break with his family, tribe and village and to develop himself into a productive unit for the service of those around him. But this is a far more sophisticated business, because the desires of the individual and the needs of his society may be only imperfectly meshed. They may, further, be frustrated by the social structure and the mores of the society itself. By now, however, the new man has become a much more independent and even abrasive factor in society; he will not be content with just any education or any set of skills if he cannot see, sooner or later, a connection between his new training and the fulfillment of his new desires.

It is at this stage that a traditional system of education will come under intense pressure for reform, both from its dissatisfied consumers and from those who feel responsible for social improvement. Support of traditional educational systems—those based on aristocratic notions of who should be allowed to have an education, on ancient patterns of lecture-response, on outmoded and irrelevant curriculums, on part-time faculty—can in fact be counter-productive, for such education will only discourage our new man and block his progress. It is also for those at this stage of development that the setting of educational priorities is so important. Exclusive emphasis on literacy programs may be the key factor in giving a sense of achievement to our dissatisfied man in stage 2, but if educational priorities have not been worked out carefully—if all the investment of money and talent has gone into literacy training—there may very well be no one available to teach the skills needed by those who have reached stage 3. And it is certain that without attention to those in the third stage of development, there will be a severe shortage of teachers for the next generation of illiterates.

Given a degree of literacy, mobility, outside example, hope confirmed by experience, and a system of education that will teach him the skills he needs, our new man is well on his way toward modernization. He has also become a force for change. But he soon discovers that his biggest task remains. He has found his independence, and now he must find his place. It is not enough to protest: the modern man must participate, and participation involves new structure, new rules and new human relations. At this point, the process of assistance becomes complex indeed, for here individual training must be supplemented by social understanding of ever increasing difficulty.

In this fourth stage, the process of choice becomes complex as well. For it is here that the economic man must face the problem of organizing the society around him in a way that will somehow protect his interests. He may choose the short run, an authoritarian rule that will abridge the tedious process of educating his former friends and family. He may see the advantages of the long run, a more open society that will make development more difficult but perhaps more sure. Whatever his predilection, he will have to develop a social philosophy that justifies, at least to himself, the exercise of authority with respect to his interests. In short, to become an effective economic man he must become a political man.

During all this process of growth and development, he will have undergone profound changes. He will have a life independent of his family, tribe or village. He will come to value ability rather than status, talent rather than lineage. He will recognize the importance of professional skills. He will have renounced one set of ties only to accept another—but the difference is important: the old ties were involuntary, the new he chose freely himself. He will become during this process a modern individual with a new sense of identity. In his more ebullient moments he will feel that at last he can determine his own fate; in more realistic times his optimism will be tempered by the obvious intractability of mankind. Whether he realizes it or not, he will be a modern man, and his country's development and hope will turn on his energy and judgment.

Even from such a rough analysis, it must be clear that the man who survives this difficult climb is rare indeed. Some may make it in one generation; for others to reach stage 3 or 4 may be the achievement of many slow and painful steps by many generations before them. Our current focus on this precious pool of men and women is well considered. Only such people can manage a modern state. Only they can assume the large responsibilities of a modern government and bring to it the efficiency and dispassion such a government requires. Only these people have the attitudes and the amibitions necessary to master the new and important callings of science, medicine and the arts.

In our programs for assisting these new men, we are doing some things right. The current drive toward literacy is sound, for without widespread literacy the world will be forever anchored down by those mired in stage 1. The emphasis on training teachers for secondary schools is vital for the development of those moving into stage 3. Our support of strong universities makes possible the widening of horizons so necessary to the whole educational system.

Our exchange programs, aimed at increasing the traffic of persons to this and other countries, are on the right track as well. No more yeasty influence exists in the modernizing countries than those men and women who have had an educational experience in Europe or the United States. They will always know their life can be different, and they will have ideas about how it can be changed. They will always feel that they are part of a larger society. One has only to spend a day in the Department of Agriculture in Thailand, for example, to realize that there is a direct connection between the overseas training of its top officials and the progressive activity of the Department as a whole.

It is at just this point, however, that our foreign and domestic policies come into conflict. For one of the gravest problems facing the underdeveloped world is the fact that all too many of its best-trained men and women leave home and never return to the departments of agriculture or the schools or the hospitals. If we accept the fact that those who climb the ladder of change are a minority at best, that the climb was difficult, and that the presence of these people determines whether or not a foreign assistance program will succeed, then we must understand that it is far more critical for the less developed world to lose them than it is for the more developed world to gain them. Yet it is just this loss we not only countenance but encourage. While with one hand we give laboratory equipment, train teachers, send our own teachers, build buildings—all on the very simple propositions that the modernization of the underdeveloped world is in our immediate and demonstrated self-interest and that the critical component of a modernizing society is its modernizing men—with the other hand we take away not only the raw materials but the very people who have been so carefully trained to develop them.

The basis of this conflict lies in the fact that growth is the law of life for mature economies as well as young ones. The needs of the developed world are both varied and insistent, cutting across the requirements of the less developed countries in almost every direction. A mature country wants access to raw materials which it can transform into finished products itself. The supplying country believes, with justice, that it must learn to convert its own raw materials if its workers are to advance their knowledge and use their skills. Again, every responsible advanced nation is concerned about such things as gold outflow, balance of payments, trade and dollar gaps, and seeks to protect its growth by favorable import quotas and other aggressive action in the world market. At the same time, a young and growing economy needs growing markets, and the pressure to export increases as the economy matures. The less developed country does not just want to buy cars, it wants to make them; eventually it may even want to export them. The conflict can be severe enough between countries as sophisticated as Canada and the United States when, for example, one wants to sell finished paper and the other insists on importing only the pulp. At what a disadvantage, then, is Peru or the Congo in the face of the insatiable American or European colossus.

In all of this, an overriding interest—and responsibility—of a developing nation is to create the jobs and the incentives for those who are moving up the ladder and demanding more sophisticated employment. But it is precisely these people who find employment in the United States so much more financially and professionally rewarding. And it is just their talents and skills that fit so well into our own shortages. The result is that we have gradually changed our immigration laws to reduce the inflow of unskilled help, so badly needed in the last century, in favor of the skilled help we now require. It is no longer the call to "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses;" now we ask for your alert, your privileged, your brainy, your talented. Our machines can do the menial work. Today the emphasis is on technical skill, sophisticated training and adaptability to modern society.

The conclusion is inescapable. The United States as a mature but still growing Nation has an apparently unlimited demand for precisely those people most desperately needed by the countries we are spending billions of dollars annually to help. The figures are by no means complete either for the flow of assistance or the counterflow of brainpower. But the statistics that have been developed on the so-called "brain drain" present a somber picture. According to one UNESCO report, 43,000 scientists and engineers emigrated to the United States between 1949 and 1961, "many" of whom came from the less developed countries. Of the 11,200 immigrants from Argentina alone between 1951 and 1963, nearly half were technicians and professional people, 15 percent were high-level administrators and 38 percent skilled workers. In 1964–65, 28 percent of the internships and 26 percent of the residencies in U.S. hospitals were filled by foreign graduates—nearly 11,000 in all—and 80 percent of the foreign interns and 70 percent of the foreign residents were from developing countries. The drain from Asian nations, particularly Taiwan and Korea, is the most serious: It is estimated that over 90 percent of the Asian students who come here to study never return home. In Europe—especially in Britain, which is inadvertently bleeding the Commonwealth of its most highly trained men—the situation is much the same. As John C. Shearer correctly puts it, "The movement of high-level human resources may, to a great extent, account for the persistent and ever widening gaps between rich and poor areas."

Here is the cruel fact of life: we are in competition with the results of our own assistance policies. While we support the idea of foreign development, our domestic needs may be quietly making hash of our best efforts abroad. In that case, foreign aid might simply be a misnomer for domestic assistance with overseas implications. What can we do about it?

First, we must find out the facts. No one seems to know, even roughly, what our actual support of manpower development adds up to. We know even less about the drain of foreign talent, either in numbers or cost. We should get these figures and then make them visible for public scrutiny and debate.

Then we must concentrate on a variety of measures that will encourage this precious pool of manpower to put its talents to work at home. This part of the job will call for both imagination and understanding. We must recognize, on the one hand, that the United States is a land of opportunity and hope, a country whose doors have traditionally been open to those seeking a new life and a new challenge. It is in many senses a generous Nation as well as an omniverous one. Its Government and its educational institutions have adjusted themselves with considerable care, perhaps even some success, to the needs of the many (now officially 82,000, but more likely well over 100,000) foreign students who come here in increasing numbers each year. And now these institutions are adding to this care their concerted efforts to induce these foreign students to return home.

But we must also recognize the fact that we can make it too easy for the talented and the skilled to come here and to stay, and that there are ways we can help to make "home" a more attractive place to be. We can, for example, close up some of the more selfish loopholes—the special waivers that allow students to stay here in our own "national interest," particularly if they can teach a foreign language or be useful to the Defense Department; the cynical exploitation of foreign students by the diploma mills; the all-too-easy solutions to our need for teaching assistants, laboratory aids, and medical workers, offered in the name of scholarships and fellowships. We can increase the productivity of our own medical and professional schools to relieve our dependence on foreign nationals. We can, as many students of this subject have suggested, raise our entrance requirements for all foreign students, limit the admission of undergraduate foreign students, tailor their education more carefully for problems they will meet at home, and place far more emphasis in our aid programs on the upgrading of universities abroad.

Perhaps even more important will be the incentives that we can help the developing countries create to draw the interest of their best people. Gregory Henderson of Harvard has suggested the use of return scholarships and a special Peace Corps effort to put foreign students to work in their native countries. Some American business firms are beginning to search out qualified foreign students in this country for employment at home. Recently, a group of business leaders established a fellowship program for the training of students "who have a definite intent to return to their home countries at the completion of their fellowships." Where the emigration occurs because there is a temporary oversupply of university people—as is the case currently in Taiwan and India—arrangements might be made to lend this surplus to other less developed countries or to retrain these people for tasks that fit the level of their own country's development.

Whatever the specific measures—and with a little imagination the list can be endless—we must understand that modern men, wherever they are, have the same needs. The United States has come to be a mecca—and Europe hardly less so—because it provides a continual education, stimulation, mobility, contact with new ideas, opportunities to create and to serve. But the world has now become small enough and its remotest corner accessible enough so that these modern men can reach out to one another from any point on the globe. The university that keeps its avenues of communication open to alumni wherever they may be, the business that gives its foreign employees a chance to move around and bring home new ideas, the less developed country itself that uses its trained manpower to the full—all contribute to this lifelong process of the nourishment of modern man.

This country must now take the lead. We must work to increase the bargaining power of the less developed countries so that the drain is not a disaster. And we must call forth our highest powers of statesmanship to contain our short-run domestic interests in favor of our longer-range interests in the welfare and progress of man. (*Foreign Affairs*, July 1966.)

The Foreign Student Adviser and His Institution in International Student Exchange

by Ivan Putman, Jr.

Mr. Putman is director of the Office of International Faculty and Student Exchange, State University of New York, Oyster Bay, N.Y.

What can be done to encourage the foreign student to return home? Perhaps we as educators can do a few things:

1. The foreign student's curriculum can be adapted to make it more applicable to his home country needs.
2. National, regional, or local groups of students from his country or area can be organized to help maintain contacts with home people and problems.
3. Professors who have been in the student's country or area of the world can keep in touch with him to try to keep his thinking centered on his country and the contribution he can make to its development.
4. Representatives of the student's government in this country can be encouraged to maintain regular contact with him, as suggested below.
5. The educational institution can, if the Immigration and Naturalization Service approves the specific plans, arrange for practical training within the period of academic work, rather than allowing a period of full-time work after completion of a degree.
6. U.S. authorities could take drastic action and force the foreign student to go home, resorting to deportation if necessary. This would undoubtedly negate virtually all of the positive objectives to which the exchange experience was intended to contribute.

While the first five of these measures would help encourage voluntary return, there really is not very much anyone can do unilaterally to assure that the student will want to go back to his home country. Only the student's countrymen can hope to have much success in persuading him to return. These are some of the measures governments might institute:

1. Establish a regular news service that tells the student what is going on at home in greater detail than U.S. newspapers do—if he reads them.
2. Communicate with him frequently and send a representative from the embassy in Washington to visit him regularly so that he will know he is considered an important and valuable person by his country.
3. Arrange for him to go home for a summer vacation every other year or so in order that he can see for himself how things

are, renew ties with his family, talk with possible employers, et cetera.

4. Help him to line up a job before he leaves the United States, perhaps early in his last year, and be sure that he is preparing for a particular field in which jobs are available.

5. Assure him that he will not be discriminated against because of politics, lack of influence, or the fact that he has studied abroad —that he will be allowed to work in his field at a decent comparative wage.

6. Offer him the possibility of occasional return visits to the United States for professional contacts during the years of his employment.

7. If his country is really desperate to get him back, they can resort to drastic measures and cancel his passport or refuse to extend it, thus making his return virtually mandatory. (*The Foreign Student Adviser and His Institution in International Student Exchange.*)

Should the Foreign Engineering Student Return to His Native Land to Practice His Profession?

by Thomas F. Jones

In a memorandum to members of the EWA Study Committee on the Professional School and World Affairs, Mr. Jones, president of the University of South Carolina, developed the negative side to the question—should foreign students always return to their home countries to practice their profession?

American universities involved in the engineering education of numbers of foreign students, especially graduate students, are continually concerned with the frequent decision of these students to take employment in the United States and to become permanent residents here. Many administrators and foreign advisers make the faith judgment that these students have a moral responsibility to return home to practice. The advisers feel further that they and the institution have a responsibility to see that the student returns.

The purpose of this document is to show that there are two sides to the question, and to try to set down the cogent reasons supporting each side.

(1) Reasons why the student has an obligation:

The transfer of his allegiance from his native home amounts to a considerable loss of national productive investment. The student's native land has given him birth and nurtured him. Assuming he brings with him the equivalent of a B.S. degree, his value as a human resource investment is about $180,000, U.S. market (compared to about $50,000 for an unskilled person).

The country has an especial need for these young people who can become the critically needed leaders in technical development and education. Furthermore, a man's native country has a right to expect lifelong allegiance.

The goal of an individual of personal happiness likely is best served by returning to the familiar surroundings of his native land. If the student remains in the United States, he is very likely to marry a person of very different culture and tradition which can bring confusion, consternation, and frustration in his life and that of his children.

(2) Reasons favoring the foreign engineering student making a home and a career in the United States:

The student returning to a developing country most likely will find himself suppressed by a traditional bureaucracy that inhibits his personal growth and greatly limits opportunities to contribute to his country's development. He must fall into lockstep with older men, with his salary for his first 10 years dictated by regulation. On the contrary, the burgeoning educational and industrial expansion of the United States assures him of all the opportunity and responsibility he is able to accept.

The nature of modern engineering education and engineering practice in the United States is such that most young men go initially into positions associated with experienced men who guide them in learning the state of the art and in understanding the relevance of the theory to practical problems. The student returning to his developing country after completion of studies is usually denied this kind of a seasoning experience. It may seem obvious that the student should stay in the United States for this maturing process—3 to 10 years—and then return. However, the quirk of fate usually brings about a marriage which binds him to the United States for life.

The value of the man to himself as an investment resource is about five times as much in the United States as in a developing country. One may say "this is irrelevant," but let us be reminded that few housewives and almost no businessmen will pay five times as much for a domestic product as for a foreign made one which is just as good, unless laws or tariffs oblige him to.

At the moment we have an almost free market in skilled manpower, and this fact makes it possible for an engineer to choose where he will practice. The nature of the law, by favoring this kind of immigration, says, in effect, that the United States favors it.

From the standpoint of investment in human resources, it seems reasonable to take the view that the resource belongs to each country in proportion to the part developed in the respective country. If this argument holds, the United States can claim major interest in a person who obtains a B.S. in a developing country ($180,000 human resource) and spends 4 years getting a doctorate in the United States ($380,000 total human resource, or an increase of $200,000). This argument is further enhanced by the fact that engineering graduate students, including those from abroad, are almost always supported by the host institution through teaching or research grant funds—domestic funds.

As a nation committed to the supremacy of the individual, it would seem to be necessary to give the individual the privilege of a free will decision, subject only to the bounds of law of his nation and ours. If an educational institution sets up regulations restricting the choice of an individual because of his national origin, isn't such action inconsistent with the philosophies of Western institutions?

It does not even seem possible to say that the developing nation will be best served by the return of its American-educated engineers. The world's modern concepts of the manmade world of plenty has arisen out of engineering practice in the Western World and predominantly in the United States. The cutting edge of science and engineering is clearly the bootstrap by which man is lifted in material welfare. We must face the fact that developing countries should not hope to be significant contributors to the forefront until their economics can support research and development activities (even in the United States these activities are strongly focused in 10 States with only modest activity in the other 39 in which importation of technological progress is the mode, and "brain drain" is abhorred but accepted).

This fact seems to indicate that planning in science and engineering should be on a worldwide basis with the objective of greatest good to the greatest number. Such a plan would, no doubt, encourage a free talent market. The basic advances will be made predominantly in the science centers which will be in the developed countries, and these will continue to point the way to worldwide affluence.

This discussion applies to the student who comes to the United States to study on his own resources and U.S. resources. This discussion does not relate to the student who is obligated by a government or private grant or contract to return to his native land after study in the United States.

REDUCING "BRAIN DRAIN" OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The "brain drain" of developing countries is a natural consequence of the status of things. If it is desired to minimize the outward flow of brainpower, or even to reverse the trend, action must be taken either to put on the brakes or reverse the forces causing the flow.

The "brakes" can be put on by erecting legal barriers or regulations in nations and/or in institutions. (These are likely to be repugnant to free men.)

We can reverse the forces causing flow by—

> Urging, counseling, and guiding the foreign student to seek a mate of similar nationality, thereby assuring permanent ties with the homelands (he may then choose to return) when he finds a suitable opportunity at home, or becomes wealthy in the United States, or gets overcome with nostalgia. * * *
>
> Foster the development of opportunities in the homeland equal to those here. There are several facets:
>
> (*a*) Cause the salary scale for really able people to change. The cost of a good hotel room in New Delhi is about the same as in Columbia, S.C.—why should an engineer's salary be so much less? (India does not feel a great need for him?) The salary scale is based on what the native engineer *has* been doing in the developing country—not what a highly trained engineer *can* do. Therefore,
>
> (*b*) Organize projects needed by the developing nations and arrange employment in the projects on the basis of merit—this should favor the product of our graduate schools. Especial planning should insure that capable and mature men are on the project who will give the young men responsibility, and guidance of the kind they would have in the United States. In other words, arrange an American-type engineering experience in the native land.
>
> (*c*) Establish a register which facilitates bringing opportunities in the native land to the attention of those of foreign birth who practice engineering in the United States. Once established, the register should be used.

Incidentally, no one has yet proposed trying to get all foreign-born professors to return to their native lands. No self-respecting university would hear of it. Why then, are we so concerned? (Memorandum, June 6, 1966.)

The Overseas Selection of Foreign Students

a report from Education and World Affairs

As an outgrowth of its 1963–64 study of policy issues in the field of foreign students (The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?), Education and World Affairs undertook a further study of the feasibility of establishing overseas field offices for the counseling, evaluation, and testing of foreign student applicants before they leave for the United States. The study committee consisted of two EWA trustees, Vincent M. Barnett, Jr., president of Colgate University, and Edward S. Mason, Lamont University professor of Harvard, with Mark L. Peisch, former director of admissions of Columbia University, as study director. The committee's report, published in 1966 as "The Overseas Selection of Foreign Students," included the following findings of fact and recommendations:

The committee presents the following summary findings and recommendations:

1. All evidence indicates that the number of foreign candidates for study in the United States will continue to grow.
2. An increasing percentage of these candidates will come from the so-called less developed countries.
3. It appears probable that the number of applicants for graduate study will increase even more rapidly than the number for undergraduate study.
4. The most important service overseas field offices could perform for American colleges and universities would be the counseling, evaluating, and testing of applicants before they leave for the United States.
5. Less than 25 percent of the foreign students admitted to American universities receive systematic counseling or are subjected to any tests. The others are admitted to American colleges and universities solely on recommendations of teachers and friends, and on correspondence and submission of records. The evaluation of these records and recommendations presents great difficulties to admissions officers in the United States.
6. There are a number of counseling and screening agencies in the field and some duplication of effort. On the whole, the committee does not consider that such duplication as now exists is a serious problem. Duplication will become critical, however, if various agencies expand their services in identical areas abroad.
7. More serious is the fact that the coverage of the areas from which applications come is uneven. The services available are probably not more than barely adequate in any area; they are much less than adequate in most areas.
8. The selection standards of American colleges and universities differ widely. Some institutions appear content to admit students

on the basis of correspondence, recommendations, and records. Others insist on an elaborate screening process.

9. There are only a few programs of selection of foreign students in which the universities effectively control the admissions process through representatives who participate fully at each stage. Among these are the African Scholarship Program of American Universities (ASPAU), the Laitn American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LAS PAU), and the Williams and Harvard programs for a selected number of special students. These are expensive selection systems requiring interviews abroad by admissions officers of the admitting universities. This is probably the only way in which universities can be said to control fully the admissions procedure.

10. The primary need of American colleges and universities, if they are to cope effectively with the expanding number of applications from abroad, is an adequate number of overseas offices capable of providing counseling, evaluating, and testing services of a level at least equal to the minimum standard required for admission of domestic students to first-rate American universities. In this report we call such offices Counseling, Evaluating, and Testing Centers, or CETC's.

11. While a worldwide network of CETC's is not feasible at present, a pilot project in India (CETC-India)—where existing private and governmental agencies could be brought together in one organization and where the need appears greatest—should be established in the near future and be funded from government and private sources.

12. Although there is no agency abroad currently offering CETC services to unsponsored students on the scale necessary, there are several organizations now performing useful services in the field which, with minimum help, could be made into effective CETC's.

13. In our opinion, the regions of the world most in need of CETC services are Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

14. It is our judgment that the participation of local people and institutions with American representatives in the selection of candidates for study in the United States greatly improves the admissions process. We have been favorably impressed with the operations of the North American Association of Venezuela, ICETEX in Colombia, the African Scholarship Program of American Universities, and with a number of binational commissions, in all of which the cooperation of local people with American representatives has been close.

15. The effective operation of a CETC requires close relationships between its staff and educational institutions not only in the country served, but also in the United States. It is our impression that not all the field offices of existing agencies adequately maintain such relationships.

16. The existing governmental agencies abroad (U.S. Information Agency, Agency for International Development, U.S. cultural affairs officers) are not able to offer CETC services to the unsponsored student. Although AID has made substantial and imaginative contributions, it is not really involved in student exchange but rather with short-range participant training.

17. Statistics on foreign students are presently inadequate, and this situation arises principally from lack of detailed knowledge about the unsponsored student.

18. It is the judgment of the committee that CETC's will be needed only long enough for countries in which they operate to develop adequate local machinery for counseling, evaluating, and testing of students proposing to study in the United States. In certain parts of the world, however, this period could last as long as 25 to 50 years.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. *The committee's major recommendation is the establishment of a quasi-public agency receiving both public and private funds and controlled by a board of directors on which American colleges and universities are heavily represented.*

In his message to Congress of February 2, 1966, urging passage of the International Education and Health Acts of 1966, President Johnson called for the creation of a Center for Educational Cooperation within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *The committee feels that such a body, provided that U.S. universities and colleges are effectively represented, would be the appropriate agency to handle the functions we propose in this report.*

The cost of the proposed network of counseling, evaluating, and testing centers might be of the order of $2 to $3 million a year, and, in our view, the bulk of the funds would have to come from Government. In dealing with the centers, the quasi-public agency would be expected to perform the following functions:

a. *Plan and supervise a pilot CETC project in India;*

b. *Expand services of certain existing field offices abroad;*

c. *Survey the need for additional field offices abroad;*

d. *Consult U.S. colleges and universities on the staffing of field offices;*

e. *Consult U.S. colleges and universities on the use of CETC's in their own foreign student admissions procedures;*

f. *Consult U.S. colleges and universities on approximate charges for CETC services.*

2. *Certain existing overseas offices could be made into effective CETC's with small additional resources.* For such consideration the committee recommends selected overseas offices now operated by the North American Association of Venezuela, the Institute of International Education, the American Friends of the Middle East, the African-American Institute, and the American-Korean Foundation.

3. *Assuming the success of the CETC-India project, the committee anticipates the establishment of six to eight similar field offices in other areas of the world not adequately served at present.* They would be needed for varying periods of time depending on the rate of development of local facilities. As earlier noted, in some areas a period of from 25 to 50 years must be contemplated. In other areas such as Western Europe the responsibilities would be assumed, as now, on a local basis.

4. *American universities should consider the CETC's as extensions abroad of their foreign student admissions procedures and use them accordingly.* This, of course, would not preempt the right of the university to reject a candidate even if he had been processed and recommended by a CETC.

5. *During the period required for the establishment of an adequate network of CETC's the machinery currently provided abroad by private organizations such as the Institute of International Education,*

African-American Institute, American Friends of the Middle East, and the American-Korean Foundation should of course be maintained.

6. While there are certain common problems in the admission of graduate and undergraduate students, there are also important differences. *We are impressed by the merits of the American Economic Association's Foreign Student Screening Project and recommend that other professional associations consider the advisability of this and similar admission procedures for graduate students.*

7. *A number of American colleges and universities may wish to expand their use of the services presently provided under the LASPAU and ASPAU programs. They should be encouraged to do so.* (*The Overseas Selection of Foreign Students.*)

U.S. STUDENTS ABROAD

The Student Abroad

*by Irwin Abrams**

In a chapter contributed to a book, "Higher Education: Some Newer Developments," edited by Samuel Baskin and published in 1965, Mr. Abrams presented an overview of developments in programs of study abroad—their objectives, the types of programs that have evolved, their problems and their potentials. Mr. Abrams is professor of history at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

There is fundamental agreement that the first criterion of a program of quality is a precise statement of purposes. Not only should the aims and objectives be clearly stated, so that the participants will have no question about how their personal goals can be served by the program they enter, but they should also be formulated in terms that will permit evaluation of the program itself. Moreover, an institution should plan the program as an integral part of its general plan of education, never as an extra frill or as a device for securing prestige or financial profit. Finally, the educational aims should be clearly related to the special opportunities of the particular foreign culture in which the program is located.

The general objectives of foreign-study programs can be classified as follows: (1) the general education of the student, (2) the intellectual and professional development of the student in his specialized field of study, and (3) the furthering of international understanding.

General education

It is usually agreed that for the great majority of undergraduates, the proper aim of study abroad should be general rather than specialized education. The values commonly offered to prospective participants include the increase in understanding of their own culture through exposure to another, the growth in knowledge and understanding of world affairs and our cultural heritage, and the acquisition of a foreign language, both as an intellectual achievement in itself and as a means of exploring new cultural horizons. Frequently the objective of furthering the student's "personal development" or "maturity" appears in the prospectus. If this means that the student may gain a new understanding not only of the world and of man but also of himself, this is surely a valid aim. But if what is meant is mainly that the student is given some experience in handling his own affairs and is made more self-reliant, as some program announcements suggest, then it may be questioned whether it is justified to transport the student across the sea in order to help him grow up.

---

*From "Higher Education: Some Newer Developments," edited by Samuel Baskin, © 1965. Used by permission of McGraw-Hill Book Co. No further reproduction authorized.

Specialized objectives

In American higher education, specialized studies are generally left for graduate years. There are, however, certain special academic and vocational objectives that are valid for an undergraduate to pursue abroad. The first junior year programs were designed for French and German majors, and a large number of today's programs are similarly built around intensive study of a particular language and civilization. The oldest of all, now conducted by Sweet Briar, offers students a "* * * full academic year at the University of Paris where, with French classmates, they may broaden and deepen their comprehension of the language, customs, history, and culture of France, and specialize to great advantage in such international subjects as art, government, history, international affairs, philosophy or political science."[1] It should be clear that the students are specializing only in the sense that they are furthering well-defined academic aims, not in the sense that they are following advanced studies. The extent to which most American juniors follow courses on the same level as their foreign classmates is a question to which we must return later. But while for most of the participants in such programs the values achieved are those associated with general education, it is true that mastery of the French language, for example, may represent a major stride toward a career in the French department of a college or in the Foreign Service. And there have been certain valid preprofessional undergraduate programs abroad, such as the Rome Center of the Rhode Island School of Design, which arranges for its seniors to study under Italian masters.

International understanding

The goal of furthering international understanding needs much more careful definition than is usually supplied in the promotional literature. If it is the student's understanding of international affairs or his world-mindedness that is sought, then this is properly an objective of his general education. If what is meant is good will toward the United States on the part of nationals of the host country, this may be a legitimate purpose of the institution that is conducting the program, but it is something different from the education of the student, which should remain the primary goal of the whole enterprise. It is a purpose, incidentally, which involves the maintenance of high academic standards. It has been the experience of the Fulbright program that students who assume the role of traveling salesmen of American culture can do more harm than good, whereas young scholars whose main purpose is to achieve proficiency in their chosen field of study may earn a respect through their performance that in the long run well serves the interest of their country.

In the interests of international understanding, the principles of mutuality and reciprocity should govern institutional arrangements overseas. Cooperation with the nationals of the host country should be sought at every turn when planning and operating the program. Many programs do nothing to reciprocate for the government subsidies their students receive in the form of low academic fees and inexpensive costs for board and room. For schools whose foreign programs enable them to enroll more students without expanding campus facilities, measures of reciprocity are absolutely essential, lest it appear that these institutions are seeking to deal with overcrowded conditions at home by increasing such problems overseas. One solution is to provide special facilities abroad, as Stanford does for its own students. As a small return for favors received abroad, Antioch has instituted work-study programs in this country for young foreigners, designed to provide an introduction to American life. There are many possibilities of reciprocating by offering special opportunities for foreign scholars and students to come to American campuses as well as by contributing resources and physical facilties to foreign institutions.

---

[1] "Sweet Briar College, Junior Year in France, 1963–64," *Bulletin of Sweet Briar College,* vol. 45, No. 6, November 1962.

PATTERNS AND PROBLEMS

The programs through which these purposes are pursued are as varied as the institutions that administer them. They vary in time spent abroad, from the traditional academic year at one end of the spectrum to the summer program at the other, and in between there are various configurations of semester, summer plus, or other quarter abroad. Some programs are restricted to students of the administering institution; others are open to students of all institutions and may even, like Sweet Briar's junior year in France, enroll very few of their own. Programs also range widely in locale. Paris has continued to be a favored site, but the movement has spread first to other cities, such as Munich, Geneva, Madrid, Florence, and Rome; then to university centers, such as Heidelberg, Bonn, Caen, Neuchâtel, and Bordeaux; and then to other provincial universities in most Western European countries.

More recently programs have been sprouting on other continents, first in Mexico, then elsewhere in Latin America, and now in Asia and Africa. In Latin America, the Syracuse Semester in Guatemala joined such programs as those of Fordham in Chile, Indiana University in Peru, and the University of Kansas in Costa Rica. In Lebanon, Princeton broke new ground by establishing the national undergraduate program for overseas study of Arabic. Wisconsin sponsors an undergraduate year in India, and the University of Southern California sends students to Tunis University. There is a welcome move toward interinstitutional cooperation in these newer regions. In Latin America, Columbia administers a summer anthropological program in cooperation with Cornell, Harvard, and the University of Illinois; in Taipei and Tokyo, Stanford administers interuniversity programs that accept undergraduates. The Great Lakes Colleges Association sponsors programs at the American University of Beirut, Waseda University in Japan, and in Bogotá. The association's Colombia project makes use of the Guanajuato study center of its member college Antioch as a staging area for Spanish-language study.

Cross-cultural experience: how intense?

There are important differences in the types of relationship established by the American institution with the foreign university. In more ways than one, each represents a different world. The American student comes from a system of higher education for the many; he is girded about by all manner of aids to learning, course syllabi, prescribed assignments, periodic examinations, reserve bookshelves, and even occasionally some individual attention from the professor. The

European university, on the other hand, is an operation for the elite, where in a rarefied intellectual atmosphere, there is fierce competition for books, for library and laboratory space, and even for seats in the vast lecture hall, where the professor may condescend to give of his learning more or less regularly.

The junior year abroad: misconceptions

Relatively few of our undergraduates are able to follow courses as regular students in continental universities. The junior year pattern was conceived as a means of providing a shelter in the midst of the hostile environment, from which the American student could make occasional forays into the foreign world of learning. Prof. Helen W. Randall, who served for many years as the chairman of the Junior Year Abroad Committee of Smith College, describes the arrangements like this:

> *In Paris, Florence, and Madrid, Smith College hires foreign professors, lecturers, and teachers to give in their own language American-style courses with all the paraphernalia of quizzes, papers, and examinations. Each of these three junior years has its own rented classroom, library of reference books, its own program of courses with appropriate credit hours from which each girl who is not prepared for the competition of a university course can accumulate the necessary 30 hours for the year's work. It is an essential part of the director's job to indoctrinate newly engaged teachers, who are often the junior members of the foreign university, in the conventions of American pedagogy so that the students will be operating in the familiar context and the registrar's office back home can record the results in the familiar pattern * * *. To a much greater degree than one would wish, the junior year is a Smith College in miniature operating in its own splendid isolation in France, Spain, and Italy, and with a large complement of safeguards in Switzerland.*[3]

Some of Professor Randall's Smith colleagues would dissent from her final judgment, but her description of a classic junior year program has been cited at length because it may serve to correct a common misconception. It is a prevailing opinion, unfortunately furthered by descriptions in college catalogs, that a junior year abroad means study as a regular student in a foreign university and that anything less than that is not properly foreign study at all. There is a tendency to decry any arrangements that do not put the American student cheek by jowl with his opposite numbers abroad in courses that have been designed for a totally different kind of academic creature. But there is nothing wrong in taking advantage of courses organized for foreigners by French universities, for example, or even in placing students in pre-university courses. The student who works with a *sympathique* young scholar from a *lycée* near Paris may receive a much more effective introduction to French culture than he would get by listening to lectures of renowned but remote scholars. What is to be avoided is advertising this as studying at the Sorbonne.

The American "campus abroad"—Pros and cons

The problem for the American college is not how to provide for its students a university experience abroad, but rather how to draw maximum profit from all the avaliable resources for education, whether they are universities or not. The cutting edge of Professor Randall's criticism is not whether her institution has set up "miniature Smith Colleges" abroad, but whether what has been set up is really in "splendid isolation," Consider the case of Stanford, which has made no bones about establishing miniature Stanfords overseas. In branch campuses in France, Italy, and Germany, Stanford students live and learn in English under Stanford professors, with no formal relationship with a foreign university. The Stanford purpose reads:

---

[3] Helen W. Randall, "Smith's Junior Year Abroad," *Institute of International Education Newsletter*, pp. 13 ff., February 1961.

> *Overseas classwork, while partaking deeply of the human and cultural riches of Europe, is fully coordinated with Stanford's regular curriculum so that it is available to students not only of the humanities and social sciences but also of natural sciences, engineering, and other professions. The program furthers Stanford's philosophy that her men and women shall achieve a broad comprehension of the society in which they live in addition to preparing a specialty.*[8]

By one measure Stanford clearly achieves its purpose: under this program, one-third of all its undergraduates are able to study abroad. Stanford's detractors shrug off this remarkable figure and point to the isolation of the living and studying arrangements. But a foreign base of this sort is not in itself necessarily good or bad; what counts is how it is used. The Stanford officials claim that the academic courses "* * * derive extra dimension and value from being taught in the European environment," that classes "* * * are enlightened and enriched by direct contact with source material, that professors must tailor their instruction to the opportunities of the setting." To what extent? One would like to hear from the professors whether the setting is restrictive or inspiring. To what extent does the foreign setting infiltrate the classroom, as by a process of osmosis, and to what extent do the Stanford professors seeks their teaching materials outside the classroom and design their courses differently from the way they design those at home? This is the test that should be applied to a branch campus abroad. The question to ask is the one we raised in discussing purposes: How clearly is the program related to the special opportunities of the particular culture where it is located?

The student need not enroll in a foreign university to have a significant educational experience abroad, but there is solid agreement that the more he is enabled to participate in the life of a foreign people, the richer his experience is likely to be. The better programs seek to multiply such opportunities and to encourage their students to discuss differences in values and institutions with members of their own age group and others. Young Americans at foreign universities have the advantage of being exposed to a new educational system, and they have opportunities to take part in student activities and even to live in student dormitories with roommates from the host culture. At the same time, it must be remembered that the student community abroad is a distinctive subculture; in large universities it is likely to be an international one, and an American program does not necessarily achieve a deep immersion in a national culture for its students when it arranges for merely an academic dip.

Planning cross-cultural encounters

Many programs seek a fuller exposure by lodging their students with families, where they may participate in a basic group. The difficulties of finding the right families cannot be minimized. In many cases the relationship remains formal, and the student is never more than a paying guest. On the other hand, he may become so much one of the family that he resists its possessiveness and yearns for more freedom.

---

[8] *Stanford Overseas Campuses*, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., December 1962.

Paradoxically, each successful placement makes the family a little more cosmopolitan and a little less typical. But whatever its problems, the home stay is one of the most valuable experiences the student can have abroad, and it is worth the trouble involved. In arranging for it, colleges have had the help of the Experiment in International Living, with its years of experience in this type of activity.

There are other ways of providing exposure in depth to the foreign culture. After the study period, some colleges plan for their students' participation in youth activities, such as work camps. A period of study at Bryn Mawr's academically challenging French Institute at Avignon was followed by a period during which students could join a French archeological expedition nearby. Job experiences are just as much a part of the Keuka and Antioch programs overseas as they are at home. More unusual is the Princeton noncredit summer work program, under which college men from a number of American institutions have worked in factories, banks, and business firms in various countries of Europe and Latin America: "Working side by side on the job with people of another nation, speaking their language and sharing their burdens, they can penetrate deeply into the life of the country."[4] Each student investigated some study project while on the job and submitted a report at the end of the summer. This is the kind of experience that might well be exploited by educational programs abroad. With a wide range of opportunities available for Americans in work camps, in trainee programs in German business, in children's summer camps in France, and as interns in international agencies, it is a pity that the major noncurricular activity of so many American programs is more travel.

Of course, even a travel program may manage to contrive more than a slight brush with the foreign society for its students if planning is not dominated by the number of countries the participants can collect. Youth centers may be used instead of hotels, and public transportation instead of chartered buses; intergroup activities may be stressed instead of lectures by a succession of local dignitaries. Every opportunity should be taken to encourage the properly prepared student to do some exploring on his own. That such independence is actually the nightmare of the typical tour leader is commentary enough on the conventional program of this sort.

How much language preparation?

Closely allied with the question of the intensity of the cross-cultural experience is the question of how much language preparation the student should have before departure. Many educators insist upon the strictest language requirements. The advisory statement of the National Committee of the Regional Accrediting Agencies declares, for example, that students "* * * must be sufficiently prepared in the language of instruction to be able to take courses as taught by nationals." This is a counsel of perfection. Even high-quality junior year programs commonly give their already well-prepared students an intensive language course on arrival overseas to try to bring them up to this level. Moreover, the statement seems directed entirely toward programs of study in universities. A more moderate statement, but with similar emphasis, is that of the Carnegie Corp.:

---

[4] Edward D. Sullivan. *Princeton Program for Summer Work Abroad: Report for the Summer of 1962*, Department of Romance Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., 1962. (Mimeographed.)

> *To the extent that it is possible and reasonable to expect, full use of the relevant language should be the central feature of study abroad. In areas where French, German, and Spanish are spoken, it is fair to expect that Americans enrolling for study will already have had a considerable amount of instruction in the language, and that they will use it intensively during their experience abroad, with additional instruction if necessary. The more exotic the language the less reasonable it is to expect such mastery.*[5]

There can be no question about the desirability of as much language preparation as possible. To gain the most significant experience of a foreign society clearly demands knowledge of its language. Returning students report that perhaps their greatest intellectual satisfactions abroad came from the competence they acquired in living and moving and having their being in another tongue. But there are valid programs in non-English-speaking areas that do not have such entrance requirements. Syracuse has intentionally designed its semester in Florence for the great majority of American undergraduates who lack language proficiency. Students with no previous language are accepted in this program, and the courses are conducted in English. But immediately upon arrival the students are placed with non-English-speaking families, and there is intensive Italian course work. The Syracuse administrators report that under such conditions both a high-caliber academic achievement and a meaningful cultural experience can be attained in a period of 15 or 16 weeks.[6] Hollins College similarly includes students without language study among the participants in its French program and reports that at the end of a year, they have shown remarkable progress in the language. For the Stanford program, "language prerequisites are kept at a moderate, easily met level so that it is possible for students in virtually all academic fields to attend." As in the Syracuse semester in Florence, they receive intensive language instruction, although the compelling incentive of the family stay is lacking.

The insistence upon language preparation is in general a sound one and can help upgrade standards. Stiff language requirements may well be the hallmark of a program of quality, while complete neglect of the local language will raise questions about a program's isolation. Even a summer program in general studies can make some effort along this line. The Hope College summer session in Vienna, for example, is conducted in English, but students live with Viennese families, and German study is required of all participants, the lowest level being a noncredit introduction to the *Umgangsprache*, "German for Visitors." Yet language study can be overemphasized. In countries where an exotic language is spoken, a program might well settle for a rudimentary conversational ability and plan academic work in English, either in classes or in field projects which require no great competence in the local tongue. Otherwise, far too much of the world would be off limits to our wandering students, including those very regions that will be of the greatest importance in their future. Language qualifications must depend upon the general purpose of the particular program; there can be no universally set standards.

---

[5] *Carnegie Corp. of New York Quarterly*, vol. 9, No. 1, p. 2, January 1961.

[6] John Clarke Adams, *A Report on the Semester in Italy*, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y., 1960.

Who should go?

Language ability is only one of the student qualifications about which there is debate. A fundamental question is whether the average student should be allowed to go. Such educators as Harlan Cleveland and Samuel Gould have urged that every undergraduate should have the chance. There are colleges where this is attempted. Lake Erie, for example, sends its whole junior class abroad for the winter semester, and the Oberlin Conservatory formerly had a similar policy. Kalamazoo, with a well-endowed program, seeks "* * * to provide as an integral part of a Kalamazoo undergraduate education a period of foreign study for as many of our students (hopefully almost all) as can profit from it." To implement this aim, the Kalamazoo planners have had to arrange three different types of programs for students with differing levels of foreign-language ability.[7] Most colleges are more selective in their requirements and insist on an academic average of at least C-plus, while several institutions restrict the foreign opportunities to honors students. There is general agreement that participants should be mature and stable, and some colleges specify that they should be qualified to be good ambassadors for their country. The programs that provide the greatest cultural immersion need to be most careful about personal qualifications other than academic prowess. The basic problem is that a student's success on the home campus by no means insures success abroad, and tests have not yet been devised that can confidently predict good performance under conditions of cross-cultural impact. Moreover, individual failure abroad can have serious consequences, and not only for the student. As President Murray of Elmira College has pointed out in a letter to the author:

> Some kinds of aberrations at home would be ignored and considered par for the course, but the same actions by students abroad could cause something just short of an international incident.

When to go?

Another consideration in student selection has to do with the moment in his college career when a student should study abroad. The traditional junior year has recently come in for questioning. It has became clearer that an American junior is usually not really in the same class as his European fellows when it comes to advanced work in his field and that in any case the major values of foreign study for the undergraduate lie in the realm of general education, which is usually the main emphasis of his course work during the first 2 years of college. Moreover, the student returning for his senior year has too short a time to reintegrate himself in both academics and social relationships. Newer programs have consequently been experimenting with the timing of the foreign study. Hollins students leave campus at the end of the first semester of their sophomore year and return for the second semester of their junior year. Smith has begun to include a few sophomores in the junior year. Stanford can readily permit qualified sophomores to participate in the general education programs of its branch campuses, while a well-supervised "nearby" program, such as Goddard's in French Canada or Antioch's center at Guanajuato in Mexico can accept well-qualified freshmen after a period on campus. The most daring innovation is the program at Lewis and Clark College in Oregon, which includes a large number of freshmen in groups sent on independent study programs to Latin America and Japan after only a few days on campus, with the hope that their whole subsequent education will be illuminated by this early experience.

---

[7] *Kalamazoo College Foreign Study Program*, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich., January 1962 (mimeographed).

One inventive solution to the problem of "when?" is to use the summer before the senior year for a seminar abroad for superior students, which is the basis of the European program in international relations administered by Princeton on behalf of 10 cooperating colleges. For colleges with a well-organized honors program, like that of Swarthmore, one of the participating institutions, this program represents the only opportunity for abler students to take part of their college work overseas.

IMPROVING THE EDUCATIONAL RESULTS

The fundamental objection to foreign study involves its relationship to the conventional college curriculum. Summer study abroad may supplement the curriculum; an academic term abroad replaces part of it. What can the foreign experience do for the student to make up for his loss of a rigorous intellectual experience on campus? The faculty members who raise this question are not to be dismissed as benighted provincials. They believe in what they are doing in their classrooms. They have, to the best of their ability, worked out a program that they feel adds up to a liberal education, and they are loath to surrender a major part of it. They deplore the estrangement from campus which an extended absence abroad can produce. Thomas Jefferson opposed foreign study on the very grounds that it alienated youths from the national community. "They return as strangers," he wrote.[8] In the eyes of many of their professors, this is generally true.

What evidence do we have that the returning student has made educational gains as significant as or more significant than, those he would have made on campus? It is surprising how few researchers have tried to measure the impact of foreign study upon the American student. But the classic study of Pace on the alumni of the Delaware-Sweet Briar program has found many echoes in the anecdotal data gathered by Garraty and Adams and others. In the better programs, foreign study appears to have had a "strong and pervasive" influence upon the lives of the participants, especially in regard to general cultural values and political and international attitudes.[9]

For purposes of analysis, four types of educational outcome of foreign study may be identified: (1) language skill; (2) content learning knowledge about the arts, international affairs, and a foreign civilization; (3) cross-cultural understanding; and (4) development of personal values—a clearer sense of what one believes about the good, the true, and the beautiful and of what one knows of oneself. These educational results may all be furthered on campus, but a well-designed encounter with the world abroad is more certain to produce most of them.

---

[8] Letter to J. Bannister, Jr., Paris, Oct. 15, 1785, in Andrews A. Lipscomb and Albert E. Bergh (eds.), *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, library ed., Washington, D.C., 1903, vol. 5, pp. 185–188.

[9] C. Robert Pace, *The Junior Year in France*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, N.Y., 1959; John A. Garraty and Walter Adams, *From Main Street to the Left Bank: Students and Scholars Abroad*, Michigan State University Press, East Lansing, Mich., 1959; Edward W. Weidner, *The World Role of Universities*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1962, pp. 71–76.

For some interesting summaries of recent research in this field, see George C. Coelho (ed.), "Impacts of Studying Abroad," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 18, No. 1, January 1962; and Sven Lundstedt (ed.), "Human Factors in Cross-Cultural Adjustment," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 19, No. 3, July 1963.

Nothing on campus, of course, can match the ideal conditions for language learning abroad. As for factual learning, the incentive can be similarly heightened by the practical needs of the student not only to communicate but also to find out about his new environment. It must be admitted that such knowledge is likely to be more selective and less systematic than that acquired on campus and that many programs fail to take full advantage of this incentive and actually set academic standards lower abroad than at home.

Cross-cultural understanding, like linguistic skill, is obviously more likely to be achieved abroad, where the textbook concept of cultural relativity becomes real through actual encounter and where a student may gain a real appreciation of a foreign people and an understanding of how they live, what they take for granted, and how their values differ from his own. Such an understanding goes far deeper than intellectual comprehension and can even force the student to reconsider his own values and assumptions.

Exploring the extracurricular experience

It may be argued that cross-cultural understanding and the self-examination to which it can give rise constitute the most significant educational result of foreign study, an outcome rarely produced by the conventional curriculum on campus. For that matter, it is no automatic consequence of exposure to a foreign environment or of a classroom-centered experience abroad. These values are most likely to be attained when there is in the educational design itself a plan for interaction between the curricular and the extracurricular, between life and study.

We know that it is the nonacademic experiences that leave the deepest impression upon our students abroad. It is these which lead him to spend less time with formal studies than he would at home. After all, the student hardly would be normal if he preferred a bout with the books to the stimulating discussion awaiting him at the sidewalk cafe—if he stayed in his room studying when history was being made under his window. He should be encouraged to make the most of such opportunities to explore the foreign community, and as much on his own as possible. But his discoveries are not an end in themselves. They are the raw stuff out of which an appreciation of life and a new understanding of man and his cultural heritage can be fashioned. It is up to the college to make sure that the student subjects these experiences to thoroughgoing intellectual examination. Not life abroad, but the *examined* life, is to be chiefly valued.

Weakest link: integration with campus education

The best way to answer the objection that the student abroad is missing a rigorous intellectual experience on campus is to give him one, to plan the sojourn overseas as the laboratory period of an intellectual adventure begun before his departure and carried forward on his return. As matters stand, integration with campus education is the weakest point in most programs. Orientation sessions are frequently hurried affairs, tucked into some corner of the student's busy schedule and generally confined to travel tips and a dash of current affairs. At best there may be some solid area study. Rarely is orientation a full-dress course, offered for academic credit and specifically intended to prepare the student for cross-cultural exploration.[10] There are a few exceptions. Goddard's course in comparative cultures introduces the student on campus to methods of social analysis, which he is later to use in Quebec. Antioch provides the student with some experience in techniques of social observation, which can be tested both on campus and during the job period before departure for foreign shores. Adelphi students who studied in Japan, Hong Kong, and elsewhere in the Pacific began with a summer across the U.S.A. course, exploring America from coast to coast.

The language preparation for foreign study offers an excellent opportunity to introduce the student to the cultural behavior of the society he is to encounter. But most language teachers have not had room for cultural anthropology in their graduate programs, and very few are equipped to teach language as an aspect of cultural behavior. Some of the best of them, it is true, have an intuitive grasp of the culture whose language they teach and manage to communicate it to their students through study of literary works and through their very handling of the language in the classroom. But for most language teachers, what is needed is an assortment of cultural readers—not the anthologies so widely in use today, which represent a hodgepodge of information about a civilization and which are mainly intended to increase vocabulary, but carefully arranged selections of materials from both literary and everyday sources, which would provide the basis for some logical analysis.[11] Language teaching overseas could profit even more effectively from such methods. There, the whole waking day outside the classroom serves as a living language laboratory, and the results of language study are spectacular. There appears to be little effort to arrange for this purposefully, with laboratory exercises and experiments designed to be performed outside class and the results brought back for inspection. But who can expect language teachers abroad to tamper with the time-honored methods that they credit for their successes?

The foreign classroom and the world outside

Programs overseas that move beyond the classroom to make imaginative use of the world outside are few and far between. The typical study tour, which so often is no more than sightseeing with a syllabus, could actually do better *with* a classroom. In the usual program of this sort, one exciting experience follows so rapidly on the heels of another that there is neither time nor incentive for reflection, let alone intellectual analysis. The advisory statement of the accrediting agencies does well to discourage granting academic credit for study tours. There are residential programs that leave the classroom for group visits, but this pattern often gives more exercise to the feet than to the intellect. It is best if it is not the class that moves en masse, but the individual student who ventures forth, following his natural bent for exploring the world around him—not unguided but as part of an educational design that leads him to submit his findings to intellectual scrutiny and ultimately to classroom or professional examination.

---

[10] The question of orientation is discussed in Irwin Abrams, "Preface to Study Abroad," *Journal of General Education*, vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 220–229, January 1963.

[11] Cf. the contributions of Dan Desberg to the volume edited by Tatiana Fotitch, *Teaching Foreign Languages in the Modern World*, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1961, especially pp. 64–65.

The conventional course in art history abroad might make more use of the classroom; the professor could prepare his students for individual sorties to the crowded art galleries or even for purposeful strolls through the streets, observing the city itself as a work of art and noting architectural monuments and the skyline as social documents. There are drama courses, especially in the Paris programs, that use such methods, planning the curriculum according to the season's theatrical fare. The student prepares for the performance by reading the play and listening to lectures; then he spends the evening at the theater, and afterward he writes his critique.

This takes no great imagination to arrange, but it suggests a pattern that could be used in other courses. A lecture in geography would introduce the student to a landscape. Then he would explore it for himself on a hosteling trip, asking questions at marketplace, farm, and railroad station; perhaps taking photographs or making sketches; noting his observations in his journal; and on his return, putting his findings together in a formal report.

There are a few programs that send students on well-planned independent study projects. The Princeton international relations program, already referred to, is an excellent example of how this can be done as part of a total experience that integrates campus and overseas. As part of their application, superior students from the cooperating colleges propose individual subjects for investigation that fall within an announced general topic, such as "Nationalism" or "The Impact of the Non-European World upon Western Europe." In the spring period on campus, they receive academic credit for preparatory work on the project. Soon after the end of the school year, the director and the students assemble at the Institute for Social Studies at The Hague, where in a 2-week seminar they criticize one another's projects and make arrangements for the research period. Then the students move individually to the scene of their research, where they spend the next 2 months. During this period each is on his own, although during the first month each is placed in a family by the Experiment in International Living and may be visited by the director. At the end of the summer the group reassembles at Oxford University to report findings at a 2-week seminar. After his return to campus, each student works his data into a thesis submitted to his professor. The thesis represents the equivalent of at least one yearlong course.

Another pattern that holds promise is for the American institution to establish a field station overseas, where its professors would be engaged in research, assisted by superior students who might at the same time carry on individual study projects. The anthropology program administered by Columbia has been organized along these lines. Designed not for fledgling anthropologists but to yield cross-cultural understanding, the program has placed Spanish-speaking students at work on individual research projects in field stations of these universities in Ecuador, Mexico, Brazil, and Peru. Some of the students have worked individually in small villages. Such project-centered programs are likely to increase in the future, not only in Europe, but (especially as foreign study moves into new parts of the world, like Africa) also where the traditional patterns devised for Europe are less appropriate. It is worthy of note that both the Columbia anthropology program and the Princeton international relations program draw support from the Carnegie Foundation, which has a special concern that overseas programs be constructed that can appeal to the ablest students.[12]

Educational experimentation is also fostered in the study centers abroad in which American faculty live with their students. There may be drawbacks in such an arrangement, but it has all the advantages of the very small college, and new teaching methods, some of them quite impromptu, may be tried. What Stanford says of faculty-student relationships is true of many another American faculty abroad: "the professors * * * literally live with their students, teaching in and out of the classroom." Redlands reports similar advantages in its Salzburg program, where faculty and students lived together in a hotel and where the dining room was transformed at breakfast time into a classroom, with each table taking a special topic for discussion. The Redlands professors found that in such informal settings students could take far more responsibility for planning and leading discussion, and they came to know the students so well that they were able to dispense with formal examinations.

Debriefing: planned or unplanned?

In such a discussion setting or through some other device, the student should be called upon not only to demonstrate the factual knowledge and the linguistic skill he has acquired abroad but also to try to transmute some of the intangibles of his foreign experience into data for intellectual examination. The results of his "extracurricular" exploration are too often left unexamined on the student's return. The college has the responsibility, not so much to pry into his inner life, but to see to it that he gives careful scrutiny to the values of which his foreign experience has helped him become aware. This is all the more essential because the returning student, often the very one who has most successfully come to grips with the demands of living in an alien society, suffers a cultural shock on reentry that is all the more severe because it is so unexpected. He knew he would find things very different abroad, but he is ill prepared on his return for the realization not only that he himself has changed but also that the old familiar surroundings are no longer the same and that he "can't go home again." It is at this very moment, when the student is seeking to relocate himself and his world, that the college should provide academic arrangements through which potentially disruptive and negative feelings can become the stimuli for one of the most crucial educational experiences of his college years. At the very least there should be occasions when he discusses with his mentors what he is learning about cultural differences; at most his professors can help him refine the questions that he is asking himself as he develops a philosophy for his life. Unfortunately, there is little indication that colleges have been very imaginative in aiding the returned student to consolidate such gains of study abroad.

Academic crediting

In the evaluation of the results of a student's study abroad, the problem of academic crediting is a major concern. Here is an area where something positive can be done to raise standards, and the statements of the various educational bodies are emphatic about the point that academic credit for foreign work should be granted using the same criteria for quality that are used for work on campus. Prevailing methods of handling crediting differ considerably. Institutions that set up their own programs alongside those of the foreign university have no problem in duplicating stateside practices, although they must acquaint the local teachers whom they employ with American expectations of quality and quantity of accomplishment. Programs that encourage participation in regular university courses overseas run into difficulties. Course examinations are not common, and when the American director arranges for special ones to be given or seeks to take advantage of such available examinations as those for scholarship students in Germany, he often finds that the European professor does not take these occasions very seriously. Frequently our student will receive as a grade the equivalent of the "foreign-student B" in America. In any case it is up to the American director to translate the local evaluation into the appropriate symbols for the registrar at home. Some colleges simplify this procedure by granting a "satisfactory" for the whole program abroad, when deserved, instead of a distinctive grade for each course. Colleges follow different policies when their student returns from a program administered by another institution. His grades may be automatically registered as transfer credit, or he may also have to submit for inspection tangible evidence of his accomplishment, such as his class notes, papers, and examinations, and then be tested once more. The final examination at home is viewed in different ways. There are those who are indignant about the fact that credits earned in reputable institutions abroad need any review whatsoever. On the other hand, there are professors who are disposed to hold foreign evaluations as suspect. Such matters of principle apart, many faculty members agree in regarding the examining of the returning students as simply an unwanted chore. Under proper circumstances, however, a formal occasion for the evaluation of the results of study abroad could mean for the professor not a burden, but rather the privilege of participating in the most educationally exciting part of the student's whole adventure.

---

[12] *Carnegie Corp. of New York Quarterly*, pp. 1–4, January 1961.

The performance of the student abroad must be evaluated quantitatively as well as qualitatively. How many credits should he receive? Here again practices differ. The most common policy is to attempt to arrange a program that will give the student the same number of credits that he would have earned at home, and this generally means giving him the same number of courses. If he is attending regular university courses, which ordinarily do not meet as frequently as in America, this may necessitate some mathematical calculation concerning the number of hours spent in the lecture hall in order to arrive at the proper number of credit hours. Institutions that make use of the world outside may devise a formula to account for the nonclassroom experiences. In the study tours of the State University of New York, for example, it takes 15 clock hours to equal 1 hour of semester credit. While 1 hour of lecture or discussion is reckoned at par value, it takes 2 hours of attendance at performances or visits to museums, preceded by adequate preparation, to equal 1 such hour; for such activities engaged in without preparation but with the approval of the instructor, 3 hours are credited as 1.

Such efforts give rise to mixed feelings. On one hand, one can only applaud the attempts to maintain high standards. On the other hand, the transplantation of the American credit system to the foreign scene only sets off more sharply the mechanistic approach to education that it represents. We are accustomed to dividing the undergraduate's education into segments called "credits," which he collects systematically as though he were stringing beads and which are reckoned by the number of sitting hours he passes reading a book or listening to a lecture.[13] But overseas, where much of what the student learns is not acquired through sitting hours at all, this kind of calculation is even less relevant to what is in his mind.

HOW REVOLUTIONARY?

What has happened is that in the commendable attempt to make foreign study respectable, there has been an understandable but deplorable deference to traditionalism that ill becomes a revolutionary new vehicle for education. The foreign laboratory should serve to test the conventional way that we tend to take so much for granted. The apocryphal professor who planned to take his students through the Louvre in his usual class period of 50 minutes was lecturing to the sound of a distant bell indeed. Study abroad will achieve its promise only when we break through the old patterns and strike out for something new.

A challenge to the college teacher

The key to such educational experimentation is of course the American faculty. Too many programs have been initiated by the administration, by one department, or by a professor with a special interest and have not been brought to the general faculty for considered approval. Sometimes the initiative has even come from travel bureaus, whose blandishments are hardly to be resisted by the professor who is promised a free trip abroad in return for signing up the required number of customers and inducing his college to grant academic credit. The college that allows itself to be used in this way has a serious responsibility. It forgets that any project that bears its name overseas involves its whole faculty, who must be regarded as standing behind any grant of credit by their institution. At least the project should be first approved by them and then overseen by the appropriate dean and committee. But this is the very minimum. What is needed is somehow to turn the imaginative and creative minds of American college teachers to the vast potentialities that are waiting for us overseas, and this cannot be done by committee report alone. The campus faculty must take part in the entire educational process of foreign study, from the preparation on campus to the final debriefing. To this end, means must be found to give the faculty some experience in the foreign program, not through junkets for deserving professors, but by sending them on well-defined educational missions. Many institutions, as we have seen, send their professors abroad to teach in the program. Others, such as a number of junior year programs, rotate their professors in administrative posts abroad, although this generally reaches only one department and has the further disadvantage that the position abroad, especially if it is that of the director, requires a totally different set of qualifications from the teaching job at home. The best arrangement would seem to be to send the professor abroad as part of an ongoing program for faculty improvement, with an assignment as consultant, part-time student adviser, or simply observer abroad, without administrative responsibilities. This can be financed in part through the financial savings from group travel. As programs expand beyond the Atlantic Community, it is imperative that professors have opportunities for travel and training in the new areas, not only so that they can actively participate in developing the very different educational patterns that will be called for, but also so that they will have enough expertise to enter intelligently into the dialogue with the returning student.

---

[13] There are some indications that American higher education may be beginning to question this "class-hours-attended formula" for determining the number of academic credits a student may earn. * * *

Implications for campus education

In improving the educational results of foreign programs, then, we must be prepared to take not only the student but also the professor out of the classroom. And when we take the student from the campus classroom, shall we rest content if we merely transport him to its equivalent abroad? When we observe something of the impact upon him of his life abroad, can we make the traditional division and say, "This much for the registrar; this other is 'non-academic'?" Are we not rather compelled to consider more carefully this vital interaction between life and study, to seek teaching methods that exploit the environment, and to submit the experience outside the classroom to intellectual examination? Will we not be more willing, perhaps, to trust the student more on his own, to develop ways for him to take more responsibility for his own learning? Will we begin to look askance at that academic lockstep, the credit system, when we see students returning from abroad with something more valuable than a collection of assembled credit hours, and will we seek new methods of transmuting their experience into academic coin of the realm through seminars, theses defended, oral examinations, or whatever? Might we even come to conceive of college education not so much as a rigidly prescribed pattern of courses with specific titles (so that courses abroad must bear the same appellations, no matter what the student actually does), but rather as a series of experiences to be examined in the light of the knowledge and methodology of the several disciplines?

If we strike out along these lines, not only may the impact of the foreign-study movement internationalize the student and his campus, but it may also lead us to reexamine some of the fundamental premises of how we assure our students a liberal education. ("The Student Abroad," *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments.*)

Undergraduate Study Abroad

*by Stephen A. Freeman**

In 1964 the Consultative Service on U.S. Undergraduate Study Abroad of the Institute of International Education published a directory of study abroad programs. The publication included an analysis of undergraduate study abroad by Stephen A. Freeman, who serves as consultant to the Consultative Service. For a second, revised edition of the directory, to be published in the latter part of 1966, Mr. Freeman contributed an updated analysis. Mr. Freeman is vice president emeritus of Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., and director of its language schools.

The great majority of the liberal arts colleges in the United States now organize some sort of study-travel program of their own, or approve the participation of their students in some other program. Until 1950, only a half dozen junior year abroad programs existed. The number rose to 22 in 1956. Two years ago the first edition of this book reported 103 college-sponsored programs conducted during the academic year 1962–63. In this new edition, we list 208, an increase of nearly 100 percent in 3 years. Summer programs of resident study abroad have increased from 63 in 1962 to 97 in 1965. Scores of institutions have indicated that they are seriously considering the inauguration of a program abroad in the next year or two. Educators in general now seem to recognize that it is educational and humanizing for a student to know from immediate personal experience that people in other lands think other thoughts and express them differently and for him to become subjectively aware of cultural differences.

No less extraordinary has been the response of our students in their desire to go abroad, to study, to travel, and to have a first-hand, direct contact with the world beyond our shores. No one really knows how many American students go abroad each year, but well over 100,000 passports were issued last year to "students." It is now the vogue and the natural ambition for American undergraduates and even for high school students to cross an ocean or a frontier for a period of adventure and study. *Open Doors 1965*, published by IIE, reports that on the basis of questionnaires (to which only 63 percent replied) there were more than 18,000 American students at more than 400 institutions in 68 countries during the year 1963–64. Unquestionably, the total number of U.S. students abroad is far larger. Of the 18,000, probably some 7,500 students are enrolled this year in U.S. undergraduate college-sponsored programs, in addition to graduate students and those enrolled in hundreds of commercial and private enterprises.

The dramatic growth of this movement proves the realization of a need and its great potential for good. The proper objectives are educational in the deepest sense. There has been a distinct improvement

---

*© 1966 Institute of International Education.

recently in the quality of many of the study programs. Their administrators at home and abroad have gained experience rapidly. They have profited from the criticism made in various reports on study abroad, from increased cooperation with the host universities, and from the pressure of academic opinion at home. The selection of students has improved. The majority of genuine study programs which have now had 3 or 4 years of continuous experience seem to be well managed, and well received in the foreign country. The results in the students also appear to be increasingly successful, although objective evaluation is difficult.

DANGER

Like all revolutions, however, there are excesses in this one; and some of its uncontrolled activities point to real dangers. Programs and "travel-study" plans are now offered at all levels, from secondary school up, and with all possible types and combinations of arrangements. Teachers from grade school to graduate school are deluged with colorful folders. There are programs sponsored by small colleges and great universities, by private schools, by religious organizations, education associations, hostel groups, youth groups, voluntary service associations, commercial travel agencies, "nonprofit" or otherwise, and many more. All these programs differ widely in objectives, in standards of instruction, in requirements, and in effective academic and social supervision. Some colleges consider a foreign study program a necessary advertising gimmick in the competition for students, or a matter of prestige. Some see in a foreign program a way to increase their dormitory facilities by dumping a percentage of their students on an already overcrowded foreign university.

The failure of many institutions to examine their objectives and evaluate their results critically and realistically, their ignorance of the foreign scene and of the foreign educational system, the pressure of student demands and sometimes of faculty self-interest, the inadequacy of their personnel and financial resources, the duplication of effort, the shoddiness of some plans, the mediocrity of many of the students and some of the directors who are sent abroad—these and many other reasons make it imperative for college administrators, advisers, parents, and students to examine any program with the utmost caution.

Serious resistance is beginning to develop in Europe to the acceptance of large numbers of new American study abroad programs. Europeans are still polite and hospitable, but at some of the universities, we are beginning to wear out our welcome. The great European universities are far more overcrowded than anything we know in this country. It is almost impossible even to get standing room at a major Sorbonne lecture unless you go an hour early. It is becoming common procedure in Paris for a student to remain in his home and listen to university lectures broadcast on the radio. European students frequently demonstrate against an intolerable situation of administrative confusion due to overcrowding. There is a critical shortage of professors, classrooms, seats in the libraries, and study space of any kind.

Housing for students is in a desperate situation. In some university cities many of the native students live in hovels; others return home and give up a university career for lack of a place to sleep. Small wonder that some highly placed officials in the German university system are saying: "We want no more American undergraduate programs. They send us a mixture of good and mediocre students, many of them poorly prepared even in the German language, and expect special privileges of all sorts. If students come as individuals and pass our language proficiency tests, we are required by law to accept them as *individuals*; but we are taking no more programs."

In Paris, the chief purpose of the *Service d'Orientation* in the fine new *Centre Albert Chatelet* is to prevent ill-prepared foreign (not necessarily American) students from clogging the facilities of the various *Facultés*. Qualification tests in French for the equivalence of the *baccalauréat* have been set up like the German plan. So far the requirement is not being enforced, but some official move is not far distant. Even the larger provincial universities such as Bordeaux are beginning to set limits on foreign-study programs. Many universities are organizing their own courses for foreigners under their own control and will not admit autonomous outside groups.

In spite of this and usually in ignorance of it, American colleges by the scores are seriously considering creating foreign-study programs in the next year or two. The U.S. Congress is now considering legislation designed to provide Federal funds to subsidize a greatly expanded foreign educational exchange program and to provide funds for the support of study abroad by teachers and students. * * *

THE PROBLEM

Both urgent and practical is the plea from high-school and college teachers under pressure to advise their students, and from the parents and the students themselves: "How can we distinguish a good plan from one less good or from one which is downright bad? Is there no official evaluation or accredited list which can guide us?"

Realistically, it would be unwise, misleading, and perhaps even dangerous for IIE or any other organization to attempt an official evaluation, or accreditation of the hundreds of plans and programs under which American students are now going abroad. The chief reason is that the quality of a program does not necessarily remain the same year after year. The administration at home, the director of the program abroad, the instructing staff, the composition of the student enrollment, and the circumstances of the situation abroad—all these inevitably change from year to year and have a marked effect upon the quality of the program.

A list of approved programs would also be subject to regrettable omissions, the exclusion of good programs, either through clerical error, or through the lack of needed information. Omission of a program from an approved list would be understood as blacklisting, though it might be unintentional. On the other hand, the publication of a list of unapproved programs and plans, which could be interpreted as blacklisting, would be subject to similar errors. Finally it should be added that no program is perfect, and no program is totally bad. A well-prepared, mature, and serious student will be able to get something from the worst plan, in spite of its faults, and through his own efforts. On the other hand, the very best plan will never satisfy or profit the wrong student. * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

Advisory service

This report recommends the creation in each college or university of an *advisory service on study abroad.*

The tens of thousands of American students interested in a period of study abroad ask many questions, although usually quite unaware of the seriousness and complexity of the problems involved. To what country and to what university should the student go? Is there an American study program operating there, and would it admit him? Or should he go on his own and plan on getting in somewhere? How can he construct and enroll in the course of study which he wishes? How can he get academic credits for it and have them count toward his American degree? What good are the certificates and diplomas that the foreign university offers? At what time in his undergraduate career should he go and how long should he stay? How much will it cost? And how can he help defray the expenses? *Where* can he get information and advice?

Every American institution which organizes a program of undergraduate study abroad pledges its authority and assumes the responsibility for its success. Yet the institution which does *not* have its own program also has a serious responsibility. Educators and students now believe that a foreign study experience is a valuable, even necessary, part of a liberal education and of a student's preparation for his career in a global society. Every institution must therefore adopt and implement a clear policy on this important matter.

We cannot allow an American student to wander blindly into a foreign educational system and discredit our own by his apparent awkwardness and stupidity. Expert information and wise counsel must be ready to prevent him from wasting a precious year. Many colleges have not yet awakened to the existence of the problem and the need. We cannot count on the foreign universities to assume the task of counseling and guiding the American student; theirs is a different system and they do not do it even for their own students. The responsibility of the American college or university for its students who go abroad to study is therefore total.

The first and essential step is for each college to create an official advisory service on study abroad. It should designate an adviser to students on study abroad, a man with authority in the administration and with effective influence among the faculty. He must have an extensive knowledge of foreign institutions and educational systems, complete familiarity with American education and with the home college curriculum, the ability to deal firmly but sympathetically with students, and to hold up high standards for them. His office should have the full cooperation of all administrative and instructional departments of the college and he should coordinate his procedures carefully with all of them. His office should be in a central place, equipped with the multitude of information and reference materials necessary for his own use and for consultation by students. Every student will be *required* to consult the adviser before going abroad for any study for which credit is sought. The creation of such a post in every college in the country is of the utmost urgency.

This adviser will aid the student in defining his objective, making sure that it is well considered, worthy, realistic, and properly related to his whole curriculum. He will help him to choose between the different types of programs available, and to decide where, in what country and university, his objective can best be achieved. The adviser will have investigated carefully certain programs of other colleges which he can recommend, and in which he has arranged for qualified students to be accepted. The adviser will counsel the student about all aspects of preparation for foreign study, the requirements in subject matter and in the knowledge of the foreign language. He will give the student, or see that the student receives, advice and guidance about practical matters such as transportation, clothing, arrangements for living with families, the social code, manners and morals abroad, costs of travel, and the handling of his finances. Women students need especially careful briefing. The adviser will also create positive personal contacts for the students in the foreign country. He will be a close liaison with the director of the program in which the student enrolls. The adviser will be the official academic anchor at home, and the coordinator of the student's reentry and reorientation after he returns.

This is the responsibility of the American college or university for every one of its students whom it sends abroad, or permits to go abroad for a study program to count toward a degree. This responsibility is not now being properly assumed by a majority of the colleges in the United States. We are therefore flashing a danger signal, a warning to the college which is not discharging its responsibility, or to any American student who does not find available to him in his college this advice and guidance.

This total responsibility of a college for its student who is studying abroad for degree credit is the basic reason for our frank recommendation *against* a college's participation in the commercially or privately organized study programs which arrange travel, instruction, living, and promise or imply academic credit. We do not refer to such reputable organizations as the Experiment in International Living or the Council on Student Travel, which do not arrange instructions or credits. But there are scores of privately administered programs, institutes, and centers which enroll students for study abroad; many of them have a right to the label "educational nonprofit;" some claim to be college-sponsored or affiliated; most of them have college professors and officials or their boards of directors; all imply the award of degree credits, perhaps conditional upon prior arrangement with the student's college. Some of them offer a good program, well supervised and directed; some are good in one country and poor in another; some are definitely mediocre. Some will accept enrollment from all comers, from high school students to middle-aged housewives, with no suggestion of selectivity except the payment of a fee. Most of them are primarily concerned with increasing their enrollment, because they make their money or balance their nonprofit budgets on the quantity, not the quality, of their operations. Some of them answer the legitimate needs of people who cannot secure admission to a college-sponsored undergraduate or graduate program. This is therefore not a sweeping condemnation; we repeat that generalizations are sometimes unfair in the particular.

Our recommendation is simply this: if a college or university which is considering affiliating with a commercial or privately directed program recognizes its duty to take the time and has the personnel qualified to investigate thoroughly, evaluate continuously, and sanction by its own academic authority the instruction and credits provided by such a private program not under its direct control, it would be just as easy and much safer to organize its own program, or at least to cooperate with another accredited college.

Cooperation

We conclude with a final recommendation which will help to solve some of the problems we have been discussing. We call for a moratorium to permit cooperative planning. No new program of study abroad should be established by any college or university until it has investigated all possibilities of associating itself with an existing college-sponsored program of high quality and similar objectives. If even a majority of the 1,300 accredited 4-year liberal arts colleges in this country should attempt to set up programs of study abroad, the resulting chaos would be unimaginable.* Long before that, the European educational system would have closed its doors to all American undergraduates.

Cooperation between American colleges is the only answer. It is already in effect in many colleges and showing valuable results. The Great Lakes Colleges Association, after careful joint investigation, has developed programs in Latin America and in Beirut, and cooperates with Antioch and Earlham in Japan. The Indiana colleges have joint programs in Great Britain and Mexico. Other examples of cooperation are the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, the California State colleges, the Minnesota colleges, the New York State colleges, and the Pennsylvania State colleges. * * *

A program of study abroad which will bring honor to the home institution is difficult to organize and operate. Small colleges may not have enough qualified students and program directors every year to support the desirable continuity. No college should consider a project of study abroad unless and until it has carefully weighed its own resources in faculty, students, and finances. Duplication of effort, the resultant waste of time and money, and unnecessary administrative burdens can be avoided when several institutions of similar character and objectives pool their resources, their faculties, and their students in a cooperative effort. Such cooperation is also becoming mandatory in order to avoid the harmful competition which is now going on abroad for location, instructional staff, classrooms, housing, and other educational resources. The universities of Europe welcome this merging of American programs.

The American undergraduate will continue to go abroad in ever increasing numbers, to travel, to study, to learn. It is the duty of his college so to inform, select, prepare, guide, and supervise him that the resulting experience will be to his maximum intellectual and personal profit. (*Undergraduate Study Abroad*, second edition.)

College and University Programs of Academic Exchange

by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy

In a publication issued in 1960 the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy of the Institute of International Education posed in question form some of the issues involved in study abroad programs.

The scholarly and professional values of study abroad by American students, especially at the graduate level, have long been recognized. * * * In some fields of the humanities, especially languages and literature, study abroad is traditional. In the arts it adds new dimensions to the student's perception of the world. In certain scientific and professional fields research in foreign libraries or study with the appropriate specialist abroad is essential. In almost all fields there are developments and discoveries abroad which are of vital interest to Americans.

Most fellowship programs favor graduate students. The graduate student is presumed to have reached intellectual and emotional maturity. It is easier to judge the validity of his study project, his chances of adjustment to a new environment, and the eventual usefulness of his foreign experience. He can be expected to have a firm commitment to his field, and some of the skills needed for independent research. If language facility is required, he will probably have acquired it by the time he reaches the graduate level. Having already established himself with his peer group, the graduate student is not deprived of social and professional contacts by his stay abroad. Graduate study abroad is facilitated by the relative similarity of educational systems at this level.

A perennial subject of debate is how much value study abroad has for American undergraduates. The primary value of undergraduate study abroad lies in helping young Americans develop a world outlook, and with it a sense of the relativity of values and customs. For those who later go on to graduate study involving foreign areas, undergraduate study provides a foundation and a stimulus. The intellectual and cultural horizon of all students, not only those who will later specialize in foreign areas, needs to be widened. The process of widening begins in the classroom but does not stop there. First-hand experience abroad affords impressions and insights that cannot be provided by books or lectures at home. Even the United States is better understood by a student who has traveled abroad. In sum, "the foreign experience of the student can be nothing less than the most liberalizing of liberal educations." [1]

The idea of offering undergraduates an opportunity to study at a foreign university for credit is unique to American educational institutions. Two American institutions pioneered in this type of cross-cultural education, establishing "junior year abroad" programs after the First World War; the University of Delaware in 1923 (a program now sponsored by Sweet Briar College) and Smith College in 1925. The program was originally developed for modern language majors, but now majors in other fields of the humanities, in the natural and social sciences, and even the professions are participating. The number of such programs has grown rapidly in the last 10 years. * * * Along with academic study, short-term summer tours and projects with varying amounts of educational content are multiplying. Some observers predict that eventually every American college graduate will have spent time abroad as part of his education.

---

[1] Abrams, Irwin, "The American Abroad: A Preface," *The Antioch Review*, winter 1958, p. 394.

A major question in undergraduate exchanges is how to set up a study program abroad that will meet the academic requirements of the American university. Various methods and combinations of methods are used at present, including enrolling students at a foreign university to take courses with the nationals of that country; sending American teachers who supplement classes taught for foreign professors; enrolling students in special courses taught by foreign professors for Americans only; and establishing branches of the American university abroad. Some kind of examination is usually given either by the foreign or the American university. Careful preparation by the students who will participate is essential. Especially important are study of the language and customs of the foreign country, knowledge of one's own country, and an awareness of different cultural values. While recent studies indicate that some types of overseas assignments may be carried out successfully without mastery of the foreign language,[2] it is generally considered a prerequisite for profitable university study.

U.S. STUDENTS ABROAD

1. How can study abroad help to improve general education in world affairs? Education of specialists? What role should summer study play?
2. Is information about study abroad available in major departments of the university? Are only bona fide opportunities publicized? Is adequate publicity given to graduate fellowship opportunities?
3. Does the university screen candidates for Fulbright and other graduate study awards? How good a job is it doing? Has it compared its criteria of selection with those of other institutions?
4. Are students receiving early preparation to enable them to compete successfully for graduate study awards?
5. In counseling undergraduates on their academic programs, are eligibility requirements for Fulbright and other graduate study awards taken into account?
6. Has the university considered setting up an undergraduate study program abroad, alone or with other institutions? Has it looked into the possibility of participating in an existing program?
7. Are qualified faculty members available to supervise undergraduate study programs abroad? Is there some continuity of leadership from year to year?

---

[2] Harlan Cleveland and Gerald J. Mangone, *The Art of Overseasmanship*, Syracuse University Press, 1957, pp. 147–148.

8. Do plans for undergraduate study abroad have real educational value? Do they take full advantage of the foreign setting? Are they related to the total educational program of the university?

9. What are the advantages and disadvantages of having American undergraduates attend foreign university courses? Special courses for Americans affiliated with the foreign university? Special courses set up by the American university?

10. Are counseling facilities available for students going abroad on their own? Is some form of orientation needed by these students?

11. Should the university grant credit to students who study abroad on their own? Under what conditions?

12. Is the foreign experience of some students being used as an educational resource for other students? (*College and University Programs of Academic Exchange.*)

FACULTY AND SCHOLARS ABROAD

Beacon of Hope

by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs

In a report prepared for Congress in 1963 the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, which had been appointed by President Kennedy in May 1962, appraised the effectiveness of the educational and cultural exchange program carried on by the U.S. Department of State.

It is rare in the history of diplomacy that the active conduct of any aspect of a nation's foreign relations should lie in the hands of the people themselves, and require their personal and direct participation. Today, however, the foreign relations carried on by the United States includes such a program. This is the educational and cultural exchange program which has become a basic aspect of this country's relations with almost every part of the world.

The inclusion of this program within the formal framework of U.S. foreign relations is symbolic of the enormous change that has taken place in the conduct of foreign affairs in the 20th century.

The historical developments that have given rise to this change are well known. The spread of democratic forms of government has made the majority of the world's rulers and leaders directly accountable to their people for the conduct of foreign as well as domestic affairs. The spread of education and communications has developed within almost all nations a more or less informed and aware public to whom all democratic governments—even totalitarian governments—must be responsive. Further, the rising aspirations of the people for social justice and economic progress have become a crucial factor in a country's well-being; to a very large degree, fulfillment of these aspirations determines the strength and stability of any government, and quite possibly the future of world peace.

As a result, the people of the world, including those once voiceless or ignored, have become a dominant factor in international affairs, a significant point of reference in any intercourse between nations. Foreign relations can no longer be conducted exclusively between official representatives of various governments. They must also be concerned, very deeply concerned, with the people at large in each country—with the people's attitudes, their state of progress and education, their level of information, their hopes and expectations.

This significant fact has enormously influenced the historic patterns of diplomacy, particularly since the last World War, in the United States as well as other countries. The United States foreign relations today have come to include, aside from military programs, not only the traditional diplomatic arm, but an overseas information service to inform an educated and aware foreign public of America's policies and approaches. Further, an extensive development assistance program to help needful nations meet the aspirations of their people is today, of course, another highly important aspect of U.S. foreign affairs.

The foreign relations of the United States also include a program for exchange of persons—the extraordinary new dimension in the relationship of one country to another. This program was conceived as a direct effort of the American people to bring about mutual understanding between themselves and the people of the world. There has been nothing quite like this—a peaceable, sizable exchange of persons, carried on by a government on behalf of an entire people—in the whole history of human affairs.

When viewed as an aspect of a great nation's foreign relations, the program has four rather remarkable characteristics impressed upon it by the American people who gave it shape: First, it is based on a strong, perhaps typically American faith in direct exposure and personal face-to-face experience between peoples as a means of dispelling misconceptions and developing understanding. Second, it uses education as the principal bridge of contact—the exchange of students, professors and scholars, and also of nonacademic visitors on "study tours." In essence it is a program of international education. Further, it asserts the strong American commitment toward freedom of inquiry; exchange visitors are free to look and listen and to draw their own conclusions. Finally, it relies in very large part on private participation and initiative. The selection of all educational grantees, their placement in universities, the planning of study tour programs of foreign visitors and their contacts with Americans and American hospitality are almost wholly in the hands of private agencies and volunteer groups. Direct official involvement is kept to a facilitative minimum.

The program thus expresses what we as Americans feel are our common human interests with people over the globe—our passionate belief in education and the free inquiry of the human mind; our hope to enrich the cultural stream of life, our own and that of others; the wish to understand the world and its people, and share knowledge and experience; our desire to demonstrate, in a world fearful of power and violence, our basic good faith and good intent; and perhaps, because idealism is never far from the American character, no less our hope to find all men brothers, alien to none.

In short, something cherished is at stake in this program. It is one aspect of America's foreign affairs and activities overseas to which the American people feel particularly close and with which many, as private individuals, are personally involved—the family which invites a foreign visitor to dinner; the university president with hundreds of foreign students under his charge; the school principal who shows his classroom to a visiting Indian teacher; the many volunteers, at every level, who contribute their time in selecting or counseling foreign students, or arranging trips and programs and extending hospitality for foreign visitors.

Since 1949, nearly 53,000 foreign visitors have come to the United States and over 21,000 Americans have gone abroad under the exchange program of the Department of State. Over 120 countries are now sharing in this exchange.

Important as it is, the exchange program of the Department of State is but a small part of the great flow and counterflow of Americans and people from other countries who, on their own or with private or other government sponsorship, today cross oceans, borders and cultural barriers in order to see and be seen, teach and be taught in another land.

But it is significant, a selective part. It is not too much to say that it embodies the hopes, the aims, the good will, even the dream of peace, of the American people.

The Congress has asked us to report whether this exchange program in the past has been effective—especially whether the bringing of foreign exchangees to the United States has been effective.

This report is our effort to do so.

THE PAST PROGRAM

The Department of State's exchange program in its present worldwide character began following World War II when, acting on a proposal of Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, Congress in 1946 authorized use of some of the foreign currencies, resulting from the sale of surplus war goods and material, to support educational exchange. It was broadened when, in 1948, Congress approved legislation sponsored by Senator H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey and (the then) Representative Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota for a specific international educational exchange as well as information program.

From the time the present program began—1949[1] through 1962, about two-thirds of all the 74,000 persons receiving exchange grants have been foreign visitors, and about one-third American. * * * About half of all foreign grantees have been students, mostly at the graduate level. About a fourth of the grantees have been "leaders"—such prominent and influential persons as high-ranking foreign government officials, editors, judges, university presidents, and the like. About an eighth of the foreign grantees have been teachers; an equal number have been professors and research scholars. A small proportion, 5 percent, have been "specialists"—persons outstanding in particular fields, from fine arts to ophthalmology. Most students and most research scholars and lecturers were awarded only travel expenses; most other exchangees received a full grant covering all necessary costs of their visit to the United States.

In general, the American grantees include a somewhat similar proportion of students—about half; almost all other American grantees have been professors, research scholars, and specialists.

Initially, in the immediate post-war years, when surplus foreign currencies were available chiefly in Europe, the focus of the exchange program was on that area. In 1953, for example, there were nearly 1,700 student grantees coming to the United States from Europe, compared to 9 from Africa. As new countries came into being in

---

[1] Strictly speaking, the first efforts at educational exchange started in 1938, 25 years ago, when a Division of Cultural Relations was established in the Department of State to facilitate exchange with Latin America. It was not until the so-called Fulbright Amendment of 1946, and the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, however, that educational and cultural exchange became a major worldwide program. State Department statistics on the program begin with 1949. The legislation under which the program is conducted today is Public Law 87–256, the so-called Fulbright-Hays Act of Sept. 21, 1961, which consolidated previous legislation, and which takes its name from its two sponsors—Senator Fulbright and Representative Wayne Hays of Ohio.

Asia and Africa, considerably increased emphasis has been placed on exchange outside of Europe.

The volume of exchange has grown considerably since 1949. For American grantees alone the number has far more than doubled, to about 2,000 in 1962. The number of foreign grantees has gone up six times, totaling over 5,400 persons brought to the United States and its territories in 1962.

Most of the foreign student and research scholar grantees stay in U.S. colleges and universities for a year; perhaps a fourth remain as long as 3 years. Most leaders and specialists are here on short-term visits (usually from 6 weeks to less than 6 months), traveling extensively to see places and persons related to their special interests. Usually, the foreign grantee's visit in the United States has been programed by one of several private agencies under contract to the Department. Foreign students have been placed in colleges and universities and generally "looked after" by such an agency. * * *

SUMMARY

The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs was asked by Congress to appraise the effectiveness of this program with special reference to foreign students, leaders, teachers and others who have come to the United States on State Department grants.

After conducting what we believe is the most broadly based survey yet made of the program both overseas and in the United States, we present the following conclusions:

1. *Testimony is overwhelming from all sources that the program as a whole is effective.* The Commission was frankly surprised, though gratified, at the wealth, variety, and convincing character of the evidence.

Out of 53,000 foreign grantees brought to the United States since 1949, there were perhaps unavoidably some cases of poor selection, of bad programing and placement. There were a few grantees who left with—possibly came with—negative, even hostile attitudes, or who for various reasons were unable to benefit from their experience here. But these instances, we find, are the fractional minority; the balance of evidence is overwhelmingly on the side of success. *The evidence is also conclusive that the program has proved itself an essential and valuable part of America's total international effort.* The basic concept of the program, its potential in accomplishing a wide variety of essential and desirable ends, were overwhelmingly endorsed.

2. *There is impressive testimony that the exchange program increases mutual understanding.* The great majority of all types of persons queried, from American ambassadors to foreign and United States university heads, cited increased understanding of America and Americans as one of the most outstanding results of the program, and better understanding between the United States and other nations as one of its chief and clearly demonstrated values. Returned grantees named increased understanding of Americans as one of the most important results of their stay in the United States.

3. *Evidence is abundant that the exchange program has succeeded in helping dispel among foreign visitors many misconceptions and*

ugly stereotypes about the American people. Experience in this country, even for visitors on a short study tour, is remarkably effective in communicating a favorable impression of the American character and customs broadly conceived. Particularly singled out for comment by grantees were the vitality of American thought, the American sense of drive and organization, and a group of warm personal qualities differing notably from the stereotyped qualities which grantees apparently had expected to find.

4. *The exchange program does not bring about a uniformly favorable point of view on all aspects of the American scene; the reaction of former grantees varies considerably with the country from which they have come, and with the particular aspect inquired about.* In general, grantees from European countries were most critical; those from Latin America the most laudatory. For example, only 11 percent of grantees from Britain as compared with 86 percent from Argentina and Guatemala commended the economic system of the United States. Only 10 percent from Sweden, as compared to 72 percent from Colombia reported favorable opinions of the U.S. political system. Among all aspects of American life, America's scientific development received the highest commendation from former grantees as a whole; American race relations the lowest.

5. *The program has been outstandingly successful in providing a valuable educational experience to foreign grantees.* Although their average visit to the United States lasted less than a year, a high proportion of returned grantees report that they have benefited substantially from their experience in the United States—most notably in increased knowledge in their professional field and in the visit's favorable influence on their work and career. Only 2 percent found this influence other than favorable. Three-fourths of the grantees say their stay in the United States increased their confidence in their work; and half or more say it had a good effect on their professional title and standing.

6. *The evidence is significant, though somewhat less conclusive, that the grantee's U.S. visit has also benefited his home country,* by enabling him to transmit to it valuable new ideas, skills, knowledge, and attitudes. Nearly three-fourths of the returned grantees report that they have proposed to put into practice an idea which was based on what they learned in the United States and designed to benefit their profession, their own organization and their community at large.

7. *The program has effectively established channels of communication between the people in other countries and the United States.* Broader perspectives, a wider "international outlook" were repeatedly cited as important results of the program both by grantees and by prominent persons abroad and in the United States who are familiar with it. Furthermore, well over two-thirds of all returned grantees occupy positions in which they can readily communicate their broadened perspectives—whether as teachers, journalists, or top-level administrators. The great majority of all former grantees, both in the United States and abroad, keep up significant contacts with friends and professional colleagues discovered during exchange visits.

8. In increasing mutual understanding, in demonstrating American character and achievements, in furthering the grantee's own development and career and the strengthening of his country, *the exchange program has effectively supported one of the Nation's most basic in-*

ternational objectives—of helping support strong free societies able to work together, in mutual trust and understanding, on the grave issues of our time.

Thus the program as a whole has been found effective. The Commission feels, however, that it can be made even more effective if the following improvements are introduced:

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The foreign and American grantee

1. Too often foreign students, whether chosen by governmental or private exchange programs, are drawn from favored social and economic status groups, particularly in the underdeveloped countries where public education is not yet widespread. *We recommend that the exchange program make a concerted effort to seek out and select more "have-nots" with particular promise and talent, so that, in keeping with this country's traditions, an American exchange experience never becomes a privilege restricted to the elite.* Where necessary to avoid accentuating a bias toward upper income groups, we recommend that the English-language proficiency requirement for U.S. study be relaxed, *provided that* intensive English-language training is given prior to the students' taking up studies in the United States.

2. Similarly, in keeping with American traditions, the United States must clearly identify itself with the forces of constructive change and progress in the developing countries. *We recommend that the exchange program make a particular effort to seek out and select those candidates abroad who are sufficiently vigorous and restless to help promote desirable social and economic change.* This may mean in some countries choosing more rising young adults, including some who are locally considered "radical," "left-wing," or politically dissident. They must be given the opportunity to learn that there is a democratic road to reform.

3. To assure better quality foreign students for private exchange programs, *we recommend that more "field selection centers" be set up on a regional basis overseas, under private sponsorship, to assist U.S. universities and private agencies in choosing properly qualified students;* and to help the students select the university or college best suited to their needs.

4. To assure better placement and programing of foreign students and visitors in the United States, we make two major comments: (a) The private agencies which, under contract to the Department of State, handle programing and placement of foreign students and visitors, have made an immensely important contribution to educational exchange. However, *we recommend that a special study be made of these private contract agencies to determine their present effectiveness and examine how they might more fully adapt themselves to the enormous growth in exchange in recent years;* (b) personal visits with American families are considered by foreign visitors one of the most significant and memorable parts of their U.S. experience. Returned grantees, especially from the developing countries, repeatedly express the need for more personal contacts and visits with Americans in a U.S. trip. *We recommend that all programs for all foreign visitors*

provide more time and arrangements for meeting a wide cross section of American families.

5. There is pervasive testimony that, with many outstanding exceptions, the quality of American professors and lecturers selected for overseas grants is not as high as it should be. *We recommend two remedies:* (a) *A substantial increase in the very low salaries now offered to professors and lecturers, even if this means sharply reducing the number of grantees, as well as an allowance for travel for the grantees' dependents;* (b) *increased use of direct recruitment of qualified candidates.* Overseas requests for American professors and lecturers should not be filled if first-rate persons are not available.

Policy and administration

6. Not enough attention has been paid to the role, quality, and status of the cultural affairs officer who carries out the educational exchange program overseas. *A special study should be made of the cultural affairs officer, and the bearing that the administration of the educational and cultural program abroad by USIA may have on his work and career.*

7. "Fiscal starvation" was frequently cited as a recurrent weakness of the program, which undermines its effectiveness. Testimony is almost universal that the program as a whole has been underfinanced. *A special study should be made of the problems created for the program and the limitations placed upon it by the heavy reliance on foreign currencies. Further, two financial problems demand immediate remedy:* (a) *Funds should be provided at once for dependents' travel in order to secure better caliber American professors and lecturers for overseas grants;* and (b) *the present ludicrously low official hospitality allowances available to the State Department should be increased* so that at least a minimum of official hospitality and courtesies may be extended to foreign visitors.

8. *Better coordination among the various Government agencies involved in exchange of persons continues to be the highest priority objective for improvement of the program.* The Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs has initiated important steps to coordinate the many diverse programs; but *much remains to be done.* The Assistant Secretary should continue actively to secure further coordination of these programs not only in Washington but at U.S. Embassies abroad.

9. *The character of the exchange program in any given country must be determined by the needs and character of that country,* and not by a formula applied indiscriminately to a group of countries. One country may require special emphasis on teachers, another on leaders, and so forth. *Thus, country-by-country planning is essential,* both in Washington and in the field. At U.S. Embassies abroad, we urge our Ambassadors to give the strong leadership that is essential to a well-planned and coordinated country program.

10. *In the developing countries, the exchange program should, where possible and in keeping with the character of the program, directly concern itself with the strengthening of their educational and social institutions*—helping to produce attitudes and leadership making for progress, and to build up local universities and educational agencies. "Third country" training and exchange should be used

much more fully by both Government and private agencies which are able to do so.

11. *The new enthusiasm for work with developing nations should not lead to neglect or downgrading of the educational and cultural programs with Europe.* The vitality of the new Europe, the crucial importance of our allies, and Europe's continuing close cultural ties with the developing nations all underscore the need for continued effort in that area.

12. *Coordination of the approach and procedures of the various Government agencies vis-a-vis the universities is urgently needed on the problems of educational exchange and development.* The Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs should continue to take all feasible steps to assure such coordination, and also to bring the universities more closely into the planning phase of overseas educational programs. Further, *to relieve the financial pressure upon universities* which receive foreign students and which are now called upon for considerable unreimbursed financial outlay, *the Commission endorses the proposal that "cost of education" grants be paid to them for all Government-sponsored foreign students.*

In sum, the American people can feel pride and deep satisfaction that, although some improvements are yet to be made, the program has proved so effective to their purposes, and has established itself as a basic ingredient of the foreign relations of the United States. There is no other international activity of our Government that enjoys so much spontaneous public approval, elicits such extensive citizen participation, and yields such impressive evidences of success. In a time when most international activities seem almost unbearably complex, hazardous, and obscure in outcome, the success of educational exchange is a beacon of hope. (*Beacon of Hope.*)

College and University Programs of Academic Exchange

by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy

One section of the 1960 publication of the Committee on Interchange Policy of the Institute of International Education was devoted to the issues and questions raised by academic exchange at the faculty level.

Academic exchanges at the faculty level, whether foreign faculty on the campus or American faculty abroad, can make a direct contribution to scholarship. Exchange brings the international community of scholars closer together, and provides a vital means of communication between persons with similar interests. It permits scholars who already know each others' work to know each other personally. Communication between scholars and scientists is not a luxury, it is a necessity. Scientific inquiry presupposes the fullest exchange of ideas. Scientists need face-to-face contact with their colleagues in addition to written communication. Discussion permits an interplay of ideas which leads to new insights. The testing of theories and clarification of opposing points of view across national boundaries are essential to scholarship.

Foreign faculty can be a valuable teaching resource.[1] A professor from another country brings the university knowledge and experience which can enrich the curriculum. He may enable the university to introduce courses in subjects it has not previously offered. He brings new points of view to courses already offered. He stimulates interest in other countries, and is a source of firsthand information about his own country. He raises questions about American education that may provoke thoughtful discussion. He brings his American colleagues up to date on professional and scholarly developments abroad. He can sometimes replace an American faculty member released by the university for an overseas assignment.

Professors from abroad are commonly used to teach languages and area study programs. Even where the direct method of language teaching is used, instruction by those who speak a language as their native tongue is a useful supplement. * * * There are other fields which can be taught by foreign professors. They are increasingly called upon to teach literature, philosophy, religion, history, and geography as they pertain to other areas of the world. Under the Fulbright program they teach the arts, the social sciences, certain professional fields and, to a lesser extent, the physical and natural sciences. Very possibly courses in all fields could benefit from the professional competence and wider horizons provided by professors from abroad.

Both the advantages and the disadvantages of using foreign faculty members in teaching positions must, of course, be weighed. The foreign background which makes the faculty member from abroad an asset, also creates problems of adjustment, both for the university and for the individual. While the foreign research scholar is protected by his relative isolation in the laboratory, the foreign teacher must fit into a highly organized university system quite different from that at home. He is faced in his daily work with differences in philosophy, curriculum, and methods of teaching. Both the visiting professor and his students lack background in each other's cultures. The visitor needs some concept of what is already in the minds of American students. While helping him to orient himself to his new environment, the university may also find it necessary to make certain adjustments to take full advantage of what the newcomer has to offer. Ways of making more imaginative use of foreign faculty, especially at smaller colleges, is an area needing further exploration.

---

[1] Lam, Elizabeth P., "How American Colleges and Universities Can Benefit from the Fulbright Program," *The Educational Record*, January 1950, p. 39.

FOREIGN FACULTY AND RESEARCH SCHOLARS

1. Does university policy encourage the appointment of visiting foreign faculty members to teach as well as do research?

2. How are foreign faculty members recruited? Is the university making full use of available sources of recruitment information?

3. Which departments can benefit most from the appointment of foreign professors and lecturers? Has the university explored their use in other departments and fields?

4. How can foreign faculty members be used most successfully in undergraduate teaching? To what extent can they be used to teach required courses?

5. How can foreign faculty be used most effectively to educate the general student in non-Western cultures?

6. What is university policy concerning the granting of research privileges to foreign research scholars? How much opportunity do scholars have to become acquainted with the university as a whole?

7. What is a reasonable teaching load for a foreign faculty member who is also studying or doing research?

8. What can be done to help foreign faculty members fit into university life? into the teaching program?

9. Does the university share foreign faculty members and scholars with nearby institutions?

10. Is the university bringing foreign faculty members to the university on the most appropriate visa? Has the university looked into the best type of visa for potentially permanent faculty members?

11. Does the university know where to get information on tax questions pertaining to foreign faculty members?

12. Is the university getting full value from foreign faculty members? Has it considered using them for special lectures, seminars, contributions to scholarly publications, etc.?

13. Can anything be done to make American textbooks and professional journals more readily available to faculty members who have returned home? * * *

U.S. FACULTY ABROAD

American faculty members go abroad to teach, to learn, to do research. * * *

Some American universities are asking whether they can continue to send faculty abroad under technical assistance programs without seriously depleting their own resources during a period of expanding student enrollments in the United States. Frequently the very persons who are in demand abroad are those needed at home. What happens to teaching effectiveness when key faculty members are out of the country for extended periods of time? What values does the university itself derive from permitting faculty to travel abroad on Government and business assignments? Do the advantages to the university outweigh the disadvantages? The giver-receiver relationship, which often characterizes technical assistance, is not a healthy one in academic exchange. To justify continued U.S. university support, the benefits to the university must at least partially balance the sacrifices involved.

What are the reciprocal benefits to the university? Overseas experience for faculty showed direct returns in the form of increased scholarly achievement and teaching competence. In addition to strengthening the ties that bind the scholarly world together, the American faculty member abroad replenishes his own intellectual resources. He develops new ideas for research projects. His point of view becomes less parochial. He becomes aware of cultures and concepts not previously within his ken. His experience affects the content of his courses. New courses, and new ways of teaching old courses, may result. Insights are passed on to students and influence the view which students take of the world. The professor's broadened perspective helps to broaden theirs. He is better equipped to advise students, both American and foreign, on many subjects. Exchange of faculty members directly infuses an international element into the curriculum and the university.

Loaning faculty to foreign universities and foreign governments is also a direct means by which a U.S. university can contribute to social and economic progress in developing countries. A shortage of educated persons is perhaps the greatest single handicap facing these countries. Their need for teachers and advisers is urgent. They cannot wait until local schools and universities are able to fill the demand, or until those studying abroad return. A foreign adviser or teacher in the right spot at the right time can have a decisive influence on the way new institutions develop.

The most effective ways of using an American faculty member to render technical assistance still need to be studied. Used simply as a replacement for a local teacher, the individual American too frequently has little impact on the foreign university and less on social and economic development of the country. The transfer of knowledge from one country to another is at best difficult. It is complicated by language barriers and cultural differences. Sometimes traditional practices weigh so heavily on people and institutions that changes can be introduced only very gradually. Ways of multiplying the effect of each American faculty member need to be explored. One suggestion is to attach faculty members to universities as advisers only, rather than as teachers. Another is to establish research centers, to which qualified Americans can be sent, which would apply modern scientific methods to the most pressing problems of the developing country.

U.S. FACULTY ABROAD

1. Which departments can benefit most from opportunities for faculty to study and do research abroad?

2. Has everyone in the foreign language departments had an opportunity to study abroad? How long ago?

3. Is there a systematic effort to see that faculty members in each department have an opportunity to get in touch with colleagues abroad, and to keep abreast of developments in their own discipline?

4. Does university policy encourage or permit faculty to participate in overseas programs involving teaching and advising as well as research?

5. Does the university need to reconsider regulations which preclude faculty from holding lecturing awards abroad and simultaneously receiving sabbatical pay?

6. What kind of preparation is needed by faculty who teach or do research abroad? Are they prepared to fit into a culture and an educational system very different from those at home?

7. Are those involved in teaching or advising able to look beyond their own specialty to the actual needs of the host country?

8. Has the university looked into the possibility of temporarily replacing American faculty on overseas assignment with foreign faculty members?

9. Do activities proposed under contract programs strengthen the university's capacity to carry out its central mission? Do contract terms permit the university to administer the program efficiently?

10. Do university personnel policies penalize the faculty member who goes abroad?

11. Is there a satisfactory policy for faculty members overseas governing:

    Sabbatical leave?
    Promotion?
    Tenure?
    Salary increments?
    Insurance?
    Supplementary financial support?

12. Is the university receiving reciprocal benefits from programs of technical assistance? Is it making full use of faculty members returned from abroad to improve academic offerings and widen horizons of students? In designing research projects? ("College and University Programs of Academic Exchange.")

THE PEACE CORPS

A New Education Program for the Peace Corps

by Harris L. Wofford

Mr. Wofford is Associate Director of the Peace Corps, in charge of the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Research, and is Chairman of the organization's Education Task Force.

By 1970 some 50,000 Peace Corps volunteers will have returned from 2 years' service in more than 50 countries and another 20,000 volunteers should be overseas. By 1980 the number of Americans who will have served overseas or will then be serving in the Peace Corps should total about 200,000. This is a "critical mass" with much more potential for education and development in the world and at home than is yet generally recognized.

Will these volunteers make their maximum contribution to the creation of the conditions for peace; to the process of peaceful change; to educational, social, and economic development; to mutual education and world understanding; and not only to overseas societies but to education, community action, and public life in America?

The answer depends in large part on how seriously this is taken by college and university students, faculties, and administration.

The Peace Corps is a vehicle whose momentum and direction are determined by the people who go into it and by the forces that get behind it. With a growing half of the volunteers new each year, and most of them coming directly from American colleges and universities, the shape, quality, and spirit of the Peace Corps depends on who these new volunteers are, how many there are, and how well they are prepared and supported not only by the Peace Corps but by American institutions of higher education.

WORLD UNIVERSITIES

To President Kennedy, in his first report on the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver wrote: "As a high educational venture, its proper carriers are our traditional institutions of higher education." He added:

> It is time for American universities to become truly world universities. They need to expand their horizon—their research and curriculum—to the whole world. The Peace Corps will help them with this transformation.

Since 1961 colleges and universities, on very short notice, have helped the Peace Corps train over 18,000 volunteers for 50 countries. This has, in many places, caused a stretching and building of resources for intercultural education. About half of the first 6,000 returning

---

NOTE.—For a fuller statement of the new program, including discussion papers by David Riesman, John Seeley, Father Hesburgh, and others, and an account of a Brookings Conference on the Peace Corps and Higher Education, chaired by President James Dixon of Antioch College, write to the Education Task Force, Peace Corps, Washington, D.C. 20525.

volunteers have gone back to universities for further study. Their knowledge of and interest in other nations, exotic languages, and problems of development is no doubt helping expand the horizon of American education.

But the transformation into world universities has not been helped as much by the Peace Corps as the above statistics might suggest. There have been obstacles to a comprehensive Peace Corps-university relationship—obstacles that need to be removed.

One of these obstacles is a lag in understanding on the part of American higher education—or a failure of communication on the part of the Peace Corps. Although the Peace Corps attracts a large number of applicants (43,000 last year, most of them college graduates), a larger body of talented students and faculty appear to be put off by the image they have of the Peace Corps, an image more like the Peace Corps of 1961 than that of 1965, and almost nothing like the Peace Corps now emerging. They still view it as a symbolic gesture of friendship, an antidote to *The Ugly American*. Yet it is much more than that. With 6,000 volunteers teaching in classrooms overseas, in many countries playing a major role in the development of public school systems and universities; with another 6,000 engaged in community action, public health, or other development programs, in many cases involved in the process of fundamental social change, the Peace Corps has become a substantial venture in international education and development.

Volunteers are sent into what David Riesman calls "positions of awesome and complicated responsibility."[4] For this, the best possible volunteers are required, and they require the best possible preparation and overseas support. And for this, the atom of American higher education will have to be split so that its power is released and made available to the Peace Corps in the form of outstanding students and faculty, and in the form of excellent training, education, and research programs.

We train them for the tropics and send them to the polar ice cap. Unfortunately, Freud's description of childrearing can be applied to much of past Peace Corps training. For some of the most unstructured jobs in the world, the Peace Corps and American higher education have designed some of the most structured training programs.

Part of the problem is inherent in the very tradition of higher education upon which the Peace Corps has relied. The fusion of education and work, of theory and practice, of book learning and experimental learning that comes in the challenging settings of Peace Corps assignments is far from the present practice of most conventional education. But the logic of modern life and new ideas of education are moving them to see the value of firsthand experience in another culture. The Peace Corps can help with this transformation, too.

The Peace Corps, however, has itself compounded the problem by tending to view the education of volunteers as something that happens during 3 months of university training, then stops at the water's edge when volunteers go overseas to their jobs.

EDUCATION TASK FORCE

To remedy this, to close these gaps, and to promote the transformation required, including a transformation within the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver has established an education task force with the following mandate:

> The education of volunteers must be seen as a continuing process, beginning when college students and other Americans first consider joining the Peace Corps, becoming intense during the months of training, continuing throughout their service overseas, and not even ending after their return. This is a powerful kind of education: learning by doing and by living—by personal involvement—in the most direct form.
>
> From the lessons learned in training, and from evaluation of our work, we can now take further steps to improve the whole process. We can organize new programs of discussion on campuses for those interested in joining the Peace Corps. We can prepare new materials that convey the complexity and challenge of the overseas experience. We can enlist greater participation by outstanding returned volunteers in communicating this experience. In training programs we can make the curriculum more truly reflect the demands and enlarge the possibilities of the work and life of volunteers overseas, so that it is not merely an extension of conventional academic courses. And we can take steps to expand and enhance the educational process overseas in ways that will contribute directly to greater job performance by the volunteers.
>
> With this view of the Peace Corps as an educational venture from beginning to end, we can appeal to and involve many of the best teachers and academic leaders in America. We can enlist them in campus programs for potential applicants, in training programs, and in overseas work.

To develop this new program of continuing education that will enhance the volunteers' *learning* and *doing*, the Peace Corps, in collaboration with its associates in colleges and universities, intends to do the following:

1. *Develop regular Peace Corps training centers* in colleges and universities prepared to provide some of their best teachers and to design model training programs. These programs should fully utilize returned volunteers, include realistic field experience in America or in other cultures (often in the host countries themselves), and seek primarily to start processes of learning that will continue while on the job overseas. Instead of seeking to cram facts into volunteers' heads through lectures, the emphasis should be on seminars, case studies, independent research, reading, and questioning.

2. *Expand the advance training program* to over 1,000 trainees in the summer of 1966. Under this plan juniors in college, or experienced teachers, graduate students, or others not able to begin overseas service for a year, will begin training *the year before* they are ready to go. Then they will return to college to complete their senior year or advanced degree, or return to their teaching or other jobs to complete a contract, entering full-time Peace Corps service the following summer. Knowing what they will be doing overseas and the country to which they will be going, these trainees can continue their preparation—and will be assisted in doing so—during the intervening year. They can continue language or area studies and get further practice in relevant work in America, such as teaching or community action. The final training period the second summer will generally take place in the host country or in another cultural setting, such as Quebec for those going to French-speaking Africa, or Puerto Rico for those going to Latin America.

3. *Give the training institutions time*—time to assemble an outstanding faculty, to prepare an integrated curriculum, to collect firsthand experience from the overseas project by direct visits to the host country or visits from the overseas Peace Corps staff. Early contracts will enable institutions to employ project directors and to make these preparations.

4. *Encourage and assist Peace Corps applicants and trainees to engage in community action or practice teaching in America.* It is generally agreed that what many Volunteers lack most is prior experience in the kind of work in which they are engaged overseas. During the year or two before Peace Corps service, many prospective Volunteers could get such experience in American community work or practice teaching. They will be advised to do so.

5. *Involve colleges and universities and faculties in the continuing education of Volunteers overseas.* Processes of language, job skill, cross-cultural and general learning are started in training, but should reach their climax overseas. The Peace Corps needs a "faculty" to encourage and assist this continuing education. This will be done by arranging more full-time overseas staff assignments for outstanding faculty members, or by arranging shorter term periods overseas during which they would conduct in-service or completion-of-service conferences or seminars with Volunteers or consult with them on the site. Also needed are faculty advisers who will maintain communication with Volunteers and give advice or support to Volunteers engaged in independent study or research.

6. *Get studies of the Peace Corps started earlier in colleges through noncredit campus seminars or regular courses.* To get a wider and deeper understanding of the relevance and scope of the Peace Corps work, interested students and faculty members should be encouraged to read and discuss case studies and basic writings on the problems Volunteers face. These campus seminars could be organized on an extracurricular basis by returned Volunteers on campus or by faculty members with special interest or firsthand experience. Or credit courses can be developed as electives within a regular curriculum.

7. *Promote the incorporation of Peace Corps service as part of the graduate or undergraduate curriculums.* The University of Missouri has begun a master's degree program in community development that involves substantial credit for—and university supervision of—Peace Corps training and field experience. Michigan State University has started a master's in teaching program for Volunteers it trains and supports overseas. Western Michigan University and Franconia College have started programs for 5-year Peace Corps undergraduate degrees, involving approximately 2 years in college, then 2 years in the Peace Corps, and a final year back in college. These and other similar programs are ways to involve educational institutions more deeply in Peace Corps overseas work and to bring Peace Corps experience directly back to American campuses.

This list just begins the development of the new education program the Peace Corps needs. Further ideas and criticism will be welcome.

The Education Task Force's first aim is to make the Peace Corps itself a better institution of education and action. Even for that, the Peace Corps needs a partnership with institutions of higher education and with faculty and students willing to join in this new kind of education-in-action. Beyond this is the more ambitious aim stated by a consultant to the task force, John Seeley. The Peace Corps, says the head of the sociology department at Brandeis University, "trembles so close on the verge of greatness that the very forces it has generated demand that it go all the way over; that it become, in effect, the model of a new education, appropriate to the opportunities and the problems of this age." (*Exchange*, Winter 1966.)

EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

WHAT ROLE FOR THE UNIVERSITY?

Universities for Export: Agenda for Some Thinking

by Sir Eric Ashby

Sir Eric, who is Master of Clare College, Cambridge, England, headed the Commission on Post-School Certificate and Higher Education in Nigeria, a body of educators which made long-range recommendations for Nigeria's educational and manpower growth at the time of the country's independence. The commission's report, issued in 1960, was titled "Investment in Education."

On my bookshelves I have a 300-page report on the international programs of American universities. It records the work being done by 184 American universities in five continents, with an annual budget of $30 million. Faculty administration in Karachi; engineering in the University of Khartoum; the Yale-in-China program; undergraduate curricula in Taiwan—these are examples of America's growing export business in universities.

On the same bookshelf is a record of the activities of the Inter-University Council for Education in the Colonies, which comprises representatives of all the universities of Britain. This Council has guided the destinies of university colleges in tropical Africa, the West Indies, Malaya, Hong Kong—all established as satellites of London University, with grants from the British Government running into millions of pounds. And lower down in the bookcase are histories of the Universities of Bombay, Melbourne, and Sydney, all founded on British models; of Manchester, which owes some of its spiritual ancestry to Göttingen and Berlin; of Princeton, which acknowledges Glasgow as its mother; of Harvard, which was born in Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Universities, like systems of government and churches, can be exported.

This export traffic of universities has become a major international enterprise. You in America and we in Britain are committed to it on a big scale. Let us reflect on some of its implications.

Universities trace their academic ancestry back to Bologna and Salerno and Paris. But this is not the only line of descent for institutions of higher learning. Over 3,000 years ago there were in India societies of students and teachers performing some of the functions of modern universities. To this day in Nalanda you can walk across quadrangles and into laboratories and dormitories which were alive with students at a time when Cambridge was a malarial swamp, and New England was a trackless forest. * * *

The ancestry of higher learning stems not only from Europe and India. For a thousand years Koranic law and theology—known as the Islamic sciences—have been taught in the *madrasas* of the Moslem world. Students still dispute on subtle points of law at Al-Azhar in Cairo. The Karawain University still holds its classes in a mosque in Fez. Even on the fringe of the Moslem world, at Kano in northern Nigeria, the *mallam* still lives on gifts from his students. In the Far East there is yet another line of descent of higher learning: the *daigaku* in Japan was set up 1,200 years ago to train civil servants. This ancient system of higher education was not abandoned until 1868; and the much older system in China from which it was derived was not abandoned until 1905.

Among all these lines of descent of higher learning one and only one has adapted itself to modern civilization and, by a process of natural selection among social institutions, has displaced other lines of descent. The successful survivor descends from the medieval university of Europe. In the Orient and in the Middle East the university is proving more viable than institutions of higher learning deeply rooted in the indigenous civilization. In tropical Africa it has successfully colonized primitive cultures which formerly had no educational institutions at all. As an export from the Western world the university is as ubiquitous as radios and refrigerators and water closets. Go to Accra on the west coast of Africa or to Khartoum or Hong Kong and you will find faculties and high tables (in one institution even a Latin grace before dinner) and academic gowns and libraries and lecture courses astonishingly (sometimes ominously) like their counterparts in England and America. Turn the pages of university calendars and you find that this social mimicry is much more than skin deep: it permeates the whole life of these exported universities. Young men from villages reached only through tracks in a Nigerian forest take honors degrees in Latin and Greek. The children of Moslem nomads in the Sudan attend lectures on foreign exchange and the gold standard. Chinese girls, turning aside from 5,000 years of their own literature, write essays on Browning and Blake. Students with tribal marks on their faces, whose childhood was shaped by the rules and taboos of kinship and the vivid presence of ancestral spirits, write examination papers on atomic structure and valency theory. What at first strikes an observer about universities in London, Tucson, Tokyo, and Ibadan is not so much their differences as their similarities; but the secret of their viability lies in their capacity for adaptation. This ancient institution—the university—can somehow be adapted for export to societies as diverse as those in Cairo, Ceylon, and Uganda. How does this happen? This talk is concerned with one facet of this problem: the export of universities to the so-called underdeveloped countries.

This facet of the problem is a modern one. It differs fundamentally from the export of European universities to America and Canada and Australia. For with those exports came an exported civilization. The first students in the New World belonged essentially to the Old World. They came from villages and farms still in the stream of European culture, where reading, writing, and reckoning were skills learned from childhood. Universal primary education was introduced in New England two centuries before it was introduced in Old England. The pioneers—the new indigenous population—were well qualified to adapt the university to American or Australian or Canadian conditions just as they adapted their homes and their husbandry to the local climate. Even under these circumstances the European university has undergone great mutations in the New World. Harvard is different from Cambridge, and Johns Hopkins from Göttingen, and Princeton from Glasgow. Despite all the indictments which certain of your countrymen level against the American university you have (if I may say so without presumption) given new life and color to the idea of a university, just as some of your writers have given new life and color to the English language. The land-grant college (for example) is one of the few real innovations in the academic world over the last 300 years. But all these changes were achieved by the pioneers themselves: the exporting countries had no responsibility for adapting their product for export.

The export of universities to the underdeveloped countries presents an entirely different picture. Western universities in India, China, Lebanon, and Nigeria were sponsored not by the people themselves, but by an alien power. The purpose of the alien power was not to conserve and foster and study the indigenous culture but to displace it by a new one. In the early days of university export we were supremely confident that what we were exporting was entirely suitable, without change, for peoples more primitive than ourselves. Because we saw no schools and colleges we assumed there was no indigenous education. Because African children (for example) do not behave like our own children we assumed they had no code of behavior. Accordingly we made a mistake which still bedevils Anglo-American relations with underdeveloped countries. We did not realize that at every point the new education disrupted tribal stability, diminished the authority of local law and custom, and created not gratitude but contempt in the minds of the tribal elite. It set up all kinds of tensions. Here is a trivial, but significant, example. A Kanuri child is taught never to speak to his elders and betters unless he is sitting on the ground beneath them. As soon as he goes to a Western school he is taught never to speak to the teacher unless he is standing up. Among people who take manners and deportment very seriously this is a disturbing inconsistency. Thousands of such disturbances occur whenever Western education impinges on tribal tradition. No wonder the first impact of Western education was resented by African chiefs.

Today the antithesis is reversed: we in the West have come to realize that Western education should not be exported without suitable adaptations; but now the more primitive peoples are deeply suspicious of any adaptation we propose in our exported product. They fear that when we talk about adapting the Western university to suit the conditions of an underdeveloped country, we are trying to fob them off with an inferior product. They have become intensely conservative. In Uganda 5 years ago I came across a vivid example of this. I arranged with a group of students to discuss with them what changes they would like to see in the University College at Makerere. The first change they wanted was that Latin should be restored to the curriculum. "You teach Latin at your universities: why don't we have it here?" When I asked them: "Why Latin? Why not Arabic if you wanted a classical language relevant to your culture?" their reply was: "Degrees in Latin get you into the Government service. That's what we want here."

The first phase is hostility and suspicion toward Western education. The second phase is an uncritical acceptance of Western education accompanied by mistrust of people who want to adapt it to indigenous needs. At first our confidence coincides with their misgivings; then our misgivings coincide with their confidence. There is a third phase, when the underdeveloped country turns a critical eye upon the imported product and begins to ask how education should be adapted to suit local needs; and its leaders want to integrate into the educational system some features of its own past and its own traditional society. I believe that West Africa is entering that third phase now. The intellectuals of Nigeria and Ghana have ardently accepted universities but they do not want them to remain an alien implantation. They see vaguely that the Western university must take root and somehow become Africanized. They do not know how to do this. They are, I believe, willing to accept our help. It is help which we, the exporters of universities, should be competent to supply.

If there is a moral to my talk it is that we have a dual responsibility as exporters of universities: on the one hand to advise on the adaptation of our product to suit local conditions and on the other hand to safeguard the integrity of our product; for example, to see that it remains recognizable as a university. To discharge this dual responsibility we need to insist on certain principles and to be guided by certain assumptions. It would take a course of lectures to elaborate what these principles and assumptions are; all I shall do now is to sketch a few of them very briefly, and to focus upon their relevance to one region only: tropical west Africa.

Principles are not of themselves good: they can even be vicious and dangerous; witness the only too clear principle which the Belgians had for education in the Congo: "*au cour des lecons sur l'histoire du Congo, on s'attachera à faire ressortir les avantages qu'ont retirés les populations indigènes de l'occupation européene.*" [1]

To judge from recent history, that principle does not stabilize education in Africa. However, we must not go to the opposite extreme for fear of antagonizing the client: we cannot dispense with principles, and on one principle there can be no compromise. It is that when West Africa takes delivery of a university it is taking delivery of a package deal: a university is inevitably an agency for disseminating Western civilization. It is a vehicle for transmitting a corpus of knowledge and techniques which have international currency; and if international currency is to be maintained there can be no softening of the standards of attainment demanded of students. Subjects like physics and mathematics cannot be made any easier, or any different, just because they are being studied by a Hamitic race in latitude 10 instead of a Nordic race in latitude 5. Western civilization will make no concessions to Africans over this; if they want universities at all they must have them on the gold standard of learning. If they are not prepared to make the necessary effort to keep their universities up to this standard they cannot fully partake of Western civilization.

---

[1] Quoted by Mayhew, A., "Education in the Colonial Empire," 1938, p. 143. The passage in English is: "In the course of lessons on the history of the Congo, emphasis will be laid on the advantages which the indigenous peoples have derived from European occupation."

However, on this firm foundation there is plenty of room for adaptation. It was inevitable that a system of education founded by missionaries and consolidated by British intellectuals should be clerkly and literary; inevitable, but (as it turns out) a great misfortune, for it has taught the African to believe that the way to political emancipation is to acquire the kind of education his overlords have had. The district officer, the resident, the Governor—those symbols of imperial power—graduated in classics at Oxford. Latin is the white man's magic. The B.A. degree is the door to Africa's freedom. And so what we call an arts education has acquired a pointless prestige in West Africa. Students work for it not because of its intrinsic value but to acquire status. This by itself might not matter if it did not follow that subjects like technology and agriculture are held in low esteem. The whole system of education creates a flow of young people from the farm to the office stool and from the workshop to the desk. At the level of school the children write fulsome answers to examination questions on Tudor England and the policy of Louis XIV toward the Huguenots. They recite Wordsworth's sonnet upon a Westminster Bridge they are never likely to see ("Earth has not anything to show more fair * * *"); but they despise the rural science class which might make them better farmers. Even over these literary subjects there is an oppressive blanket of conservatism. When the board in Britain which conducts school examinations in West Africa introduced an optional paper on African history in place of British history, very little advantage was taken of it. Teachers still preferred to teach, and pupils to be examined on the Wars of the Roses rather than their own history. At the level of university there is far too much scholarly specialization of the kind which even in Britain was originally intended for the very few students who are going to become research workers and scholars: in Ibadan University College last year, for instance, more than half the arts students took a London honors degree, which involves an intensive 2-year study of a single subject; and in the same college the faculty of agriculture was only about half full. This response of the Nigerian to higher education is reminiscent of what has happened in India and is in striking contrast to the response of the Russians and the Chinese. In Russia and China technology and agriculture have been invested with a glamor which is making a priceless contribution to the national welfare. This is not happening anywhere in tropical Africa.

So when we come to cast a balance sheet for British influence on higher education in West Africa we have entries on both the credit and the debit side. On the credit side there is this: by transplanting London University into tropical Africa we have guaranteed academic standards and we have created in the African's mind a confidence that he can measure up to the standards of one of the best universities in the world; for when he gets a degree from Accra or Ibadan it is a London degree: it has the same currency as a degree given to a student in London itself. It is very reassuring to hear some of the leaders in West Africa say that however desperate their need is for graduates, nevertheless their universities must not cheapen the degree by sacrificing quality to quantity. This insistence on standards originates in the report of the Asquith Commission on Higher Education in the Colonies; it is one of Britain's great contributions to the future of West Africa.

But something has to be recorded on the debit side too. A quarter of a century ago Malinowski, in a brilliant paper on native education in Africa, said:

> To educate a primitive community out of its culture and to make it adopt integrally that of a much more highly differentiated society is a gigantic task. It cannot be done in a haphazard manner, piecemeal, by combining pressure and persuasion, and working without aim, plan, or the knowledge of all the implications. Yet, if we were to study the theory and practice of education as given by one race to another * * * we should find there a universal assumption "that what we feel necessary and right must be the best for the African" * * *.[3]

This warning has been disregarded by the people—both black and white—who have planned and directed education in West Africa. It would have involved no surrender of principles to set the traditional curriculums of universities in an African setting and to give them an African emphasis; indeed if we had thought more deeply about the export of universities to West Africa I wonder whether we might have proposed a totally different pattern of higher education, with agriculture, which lies at the very root of African society, as the core of the curriculum, and with science, literature, law, and economics growing naturally out of this central core. Traditionalists are, of course, shocked at such suggestions, just as their predecessors were shocked when the Renaissance dispelled scholasticism in Paris and Oxford. But traditionalists should keep out of Africa.

It is now too late for such a radical change. But there is one change which it is not too late to make: African studies should be central to the curriculum in African universities. I believe that at present the only places in the world where there are good facilities for African studies are Boston, Chicago, and London. A few years ago when Nigeria's most distinguished historian returned to Ibadan from Oxford he said he wanted to teach African history. He was curtly told there was no such thing as African history; and in order to get on with his research he had to return to Britain and live for a while in exile at Aberdeen. Of course, African studies are not easy to pursue; even the textbooks are not yet written, but they never will be unless a start is made in African universities. One necessary adaptation, therefore, is to have institutes of African studies; it is a welcome sign that both in Ghana and in Nigeria there is a move to set up such institutes, and in Dakar Théodore Monod has already established an Institute Français d'Afrique Noir. African archaeology and history; Islamic studies; African languages, music, and art; the social organization of African tribes; native law; economics: These are some of the subjects which an institute of African studies would pursue, together, of course, with studies in the geology and soils, the animals and plants, the agriculture and forestry of West Africa.

Even over the teaching of science in universities there is opportunity for a specifically African approach. The opportunity arises because many graduates will be needed to teach science in schools; and—difficult as it is for us to grasp this—most schoolchildren in all but the urban parts of Africa come from what might be called pre-Newtonian homes. Science ought to be taught to them in a special way. When they learn the symbolism of science they appear to understand it, but deep down in themselves it takes no root; it is simply unconvincing.

---

[3] Malinowski, B. Native education and culture contact. International Review of Missions, XXV, 1936, p. 482.

An American schoolboy will accept the idea that force is proportional to the product of mass and acceleration.[3] But an African schoolboy does not accept this as an explanation. He is brought up in a culture which is essentially Aristotelian. His natural inclination is to seek final causes, not efficient causes. Force is not clear to him unless he knows what pushes and what pulls. It was a Uganda schoolboy who listened patiently to the lesson on malaria and who exasperated the teacher at the end by asking: "Why does a man fall ill with malaria?" "Because," said the teacher, "a mosquito has bitten him." "Yes," said the boy triumphantly, "but who sent the mosquito to bite him?" For the African, as for a boy in medieval England, this is the relevant question. And so it is with other natural phenomena: explanations which satisfy a boy brought up in a post-Newtonian culture simply don't make sense to a boy from a pre-Newtonian culture. And so science has a peculiar unreality for millions of Africans, and even those who teach the teachers of science ought to take account of this. In the words of a man who himself taught for many years in Africa:

> Whereas in an English school a teacher illustrates truths, in Africa he must prove them. Our teaching must be in far greater depth and far more concerned with first principles."[4]

This is a challenge which the universities of Africa have not met.

To sum up this part of the argument: the Americans and British, exporters of universities, have a dual duty when they promote higher education in an underdeveloped country. Over standards they must not compromise; but they must encourage flexibility in curriculum; above all they must encourage the receiving society to incorporate its own cultural values into the fabric of its system of higher learning. In that way the German and the English universities incorporated their national values into renaissance traditions from Italy, and the American universities incorporated their national values into traditional curriculums from England and Germany.

In thinking about how to adapt universities exported in the British or American pattern so that they become viable in West Africa we have to take into account three assumptions which West Africans make about their universities and which we do not make about ours. First, Africans assume that the function of a university is to change the existing order, not to preserve it. Second, they assume that a university is a national, not a cosmopolitan or supranational institution. And third, they assume that changes which took centuries to achieve in Britain and America must in West Africa be achieved in less than decades. Let us examine these three assumptions.

To change, not to preserve: West Africa has already been swept into the stream of modern technology; she has been encouraged by foreigners to despise her own past; she has been persuaded that if she wants a place in the world she must accept Western institutions. This is reflected in the attitude of her intellectuals toward the university.

Among our British universities, even the most modern and most progressive of them, there is a strong element of conservatism. Contrary to what their presidents say at graduation ceremonies, our universities do not lead society: they tend to be dragged, sometimes reluctantly and protesting, into the vortex of social change. In West

---

[3] This, for him, explains force. He demands no further explanation. But * * *

[4] Musgrove, F., Education and the Culture Concept. Africa 23, 110, 1953.

Africa—indeed in all underdeveloped countries—the university is the acknowledged spearhead of change; to drive the people into the Western way of life and to equip them to survive in competition with us are important functions of the university. And this generates a curious paradox: when you sit round a table with West Africans planning a university you find them thinking to themselves: "How did these Europeans and Americans achieve influence and power and success?" And they answer to themselves: "By going to universities in London and Oxford and Michigan and New Haven." And so they press us to provide replicas of our universities on the assumption that this will enable them to produce replicas of ourselves. Flattering, but embarrassing. Well, not always flattering, even: "When I get a degree," one disarmingly frank Nigerian told me, "I shall be able to clap my hands and shout 'Boy—whisky,' as you people do."

We are now coming to realize that replicas of our universities are not what Africans need. But they are suspicious of any modifications we propose, and it is a delicate operation to persuade them that a university which is different from ours is not necessarily inferior to ours. At this point there is a golden opportunity for Anglo-American cooperation. You and we together could explain how greatly America has benefited by not accepting universities as she imported them, but adapting them to her own needs; how American higher education would never have had its impact on the American people if the Middle West had been studded with monster technicolor versions of Oxford and Cambridge, or even of Yale.

This leads to the second assumption. We are accustomed to think of universities as transcending national boundaries, happy to draw their students and their staff from as wide a geographical area as possible. You Americans publish every year a book giving with evident pride the numbers of foreigners studying in the United States. We on our part are proud of the numbers from overseas attending our universities. And it is the same over teaching staff: if we can persuade an American to accept a post at Cambridge, (it's not often we can—the salary is too low), we boast about it in commonrooms and at dinners.

But a West African university is not yet ready to be cosmopolitan. It is an instrument to help achieve national aspirations; so it stands to reason that foreign, particularly imperial, influence must be reduced to a minimum. A university controlled by international ideas cannot reflect fully the needs of the society in which it works, at any rate while the society is a relatively primitive one. So the West African does not see the university as we see it—as something which is peculiarly valuable precisely because it does penetrate national boundaries and dissolve frontiers. He sees it as something which will help his nation and tribe to assert itself, something which will give a sharper cutting edge to nationalism.

This is a natural and understandable reaction and I think we should willingly recognize it. For it is undeniable that both American and British universities exported to underdeveloped countries do have all the signs of being extraterritorial enterprises. They are staffed predominantly by expatriates. They have an inevitable expatriate *Weltanschauung*. Much of their commonroom gossip is about topics utterly remote from Africa. All this the African is quick to notice. All this encourages the tendencies toward regionalism—the influence of the people David Riesman calls the home guard locals. It is an influence which you and we are at great pains to suppress in our universities, but inevitably it is one which is fostered and encouraged in a West African university.

There is a further complication. The vivid unit of nationalism for a West African is not the nation but the tribe. He thinks of himself not as a Nigerian or a Ghanaian but as an Ibo or a Yoruba or a Hausa or an Ashanti. The Yoruba politician (for example) expects the university not only to rid Nigeria of European domination, but also insure that Yoruba aspirations are achieved and the domination doesn't pass to Ibos or Hausas. It would have been a good thing if there could have been, for a time, one university in Nigeria to which the leaders of the future from all tribes came, so that they could grow to know one another in their youth; through the commonrooms and residences of such a university real cohesion might have come to Nigeria. This was the dream of the early exporters of universities (indeed five members of the Elliot Commission took the view that for the time being one university would suffice for the whole of West Africa: Nigeria and Ghana and Sierra Leone.)

It was, of course, mere wishful thinking, for Nigeria is not yet a national unit: it is still only a creation in the minds of expatriate administrators. We have to face the reality that for a generation at least (my guess is that it will last much longer) a narrow regionalism will govern university policies in Nigeria. Yorubas will want a Yoruba university; Ibos an Ibo one. Each will discourage students or staff from alien tribes, and the Moslem Hausas say openly that they would rather send their boys to Britain than to a university among the Yorubas or Ibos. Unless the planners of universities take ingenious and very careful precautions, the universities of West Africa will exacerabate rather than diminish tribal rivalry. It hardly befits us in Britain to be critical, for even after a thousand years our own tribal rivalries still persist. If you doubt it, suggest to a Welshman that he doesn't need a university when Bristol, Birmingham, and Liverpool are so close; or to an Irishman that he might use some of the resources of English universities.

Finally I just have time to say a few words about one more assumption which has to be made when we export universities to West Africa—and indeed to all underdeveloped countries. It is an assumption about the time scale of development. We Europeans are sometimes said to quail at the pace of American life; but after an exposure to the hurricane of change sweeping across Africa, I find New York a dreamy backwater. West Africa has been propelled from the Bronze Age to the age of jets and satellites in less than a generation. The hurricane is destroying ancient tribal stability and putting in its place, what? Bicycles, radios, automobiles, alarm clocks, but no alternative stability. Western education adds to the cohesion of our society because it fits us to take advantage of opportunities which society then offers us. But Western education may, in some African societies (I think particularly of South Africa) have a disintegrating effect because it creates a demand for opportunities which society cannot satisfy.

Even in West Africa, where there is a desperate need for educated men, the demand is not always well phased with the supply. Side by side with a superficial and tentative westernization in the centers of population there are great stretches of West African life untouched by the hurricane. Western civilization in Africa ends where the pavements ends. A few months ago, in the villages around the new University of Nigeria in the eastern region, a man with a lorry was found selling fresh human heads for the yam festival (just as you sell mistletoe at Christmas). He had brought them up from Calabar and they were fetching £5 apiece. A mile or so away there are lecture rooms and libraries and seminars and faculty offices: all the trappings of a Western university; all heavily subsidized and influenced from the United States. We have to assume that for a time these two kinds of society, one clinging to an ancient and deeply rooted folk culture and the other brashly imitating a modern town in the American Midwest, will ride alongside one another in uneasy harness. The African university must be resilient enough to survive this deep unconformity between itself and part of the society it serves. There is bound to be a risk of social schizophrenia; indeed symptoms of it are evident already.

It is evident in the clash of the old and the new elites in some parts of Africa. The old elites are formed by those who belong to the families from which chiefs are elected. In local government they still exercise great power; the masses understand them and they understand the masses; tribal tradition and all that makes for stability is in their care. But many members of this elite are illiterate; they can take no part in national politics; they resist change; some of them are even hostile to education; and they are jealous of the brash new elite.

The new elite have acquired the white man's education. They possess some of the techniques for modern government, and "the will to be modern" (as Edward Shils called it) drives them to an uncritical devotion to change. They want to be dynamic, scientific, advanced, "Western without the onus of dependence on the West." It is true that some of them are demogogues and have a popular following; but they are inevitably cut off from the masses in the rural areas. They have forsaken their tribal mythology and their oral tradition for government white papers and *The Economist*. The language of modernity—English in some parts of Africa, French in others—is still not spoken by the great majority of the adult population. Like Latin in the middle ages, or French in Czarist Russia, English and French in Africa are esoteric languages, which separate elites from the earthy culture of most of their compatriots. It is significant that a third of the students in the University College of Ghana come from four big towns which contain less than 4 percent of the population. There are centuries of difference between the sophisticated Europeanized African lawyer-politician and the traditional tribal ruler. They stand for two civilizations which must be reconciled if Africa is to survive.

There are signs of a will to blend: on one hand the lawyer-politician who dresses like a native chief and who emphasizes (as the Africans of Mali have done) his negrohood; and on the other hand the son of a royal family who graduates from Makerere or Columbia or London. But the schizophrenia is widespread, and education aggravates it. All the same, the best prophylactic against this form of schizophrenia is speed of investment in Western education. The policy of university finance in your country and mine and in most parts of the British

Commonwealth has been one of pay as you go. We have had the universities we could afford. If we were still in the 19th century this would be a healthy policy for West Africa, for in those days she might have been left to change quietly and without interference, at her own pace. But we are not in the 19th century and West Africa cannot change at her own pace: she must keep pace with the world.

On the time scales we used to use West Africans have been flung into our civilization half a century before they were ready. Unless their education catches up with their responsibilities and their aspirations there will be discontent, frustration, disillusionment, and all the human misery which follows in the wake of failure. We who have traded with West Africa and drawn her into the Western World have some responsibility for equipping her intellectually to stay in that world. So there is a case—and I think it is an urgent case—for massive foreign investment in West African education, so that she may have the skilled manpower to match her responsibilities within 10 years, instead of having to wait for 50.

The bill would not be large: $10 million a year for 10 years from the more prosperous countries would go a long way toward meeting the need. It is a modest investment for keeping West Africa in the stream of Western civilization. It is a challenge particularly to the countries which export universities. We have a responsibility not only to think about the adaptations which a university needs if it is to be viable in underdeveloped countries; we have a responsibility, too, for subsidizing our export. And on this challenge I close.

The Universities' Stake in the Developing Nations

*by Harold L. Enarson**

Mr. Enarson, formerly with AID, is president of Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio.

How can the United States help the developing nations build systems of education adequate to their needs? The answer lies in making far better use of our universities in the foreign assistance program. Our U.S. universities are a great reservoir of specialized talent of the kind needed in the modernizing of the developing nations. However, we are a long way from making proper use of the special skills of the university community. Perhaps a brief recital of the ways in which our universities are now involved in the foreign assistance program will illuminate the point.

At present, the Agency for International Development has 118 contracts with 69 universities to provide various kinds of technical assistance in 37 countries. AID has currently committed about $136 million in support of university contracts. Under these contracts, U.S. faculty members work abroad in ministries and in universities as advisers and as teachers. We are helping to set up teacher-training programs, to start modern schools of agriculture, to modernize schools of engineering and medicine, to build into foreign universities programs essential to development, such as business and public administration and public health.

The contribution of U.S. universities is impressive in its variety; it is less impressive in its impact. Frank Bowles recently voiced a criticism increasingly common in academic circles. He said:

> They are not used as universities but are necessarily employed piecemeal—a school of librarianship here, a public administration program there, agriculture somewhere else. In piecemeal operations they rarely command the best administrative talent, or the best teachers from the parent institution. In fact, too often the overseas operation is staffed by men recruited for the purpose, not members of the faculty, very often men who are retired from other institutions, while the regular staff and organization of the university are untouched by the overseas undertaking.

In the days of innocence when the point 4 program was conceived, we talked of the export of "American know-how," and we conceived of this as a relatively simple transaction beween willing teachers and willing learners. After a decade of trial and error, we know better. Some of the programs we have tried to transplant have been paper flowers—they look good but, lacking roots, they cannot survive. Good intentions are not enough in the face of the barriers of a strange language and a strange culture. The implicit assumption that the U.S. way is the best way—for the Colombians, the Indonesians, the Nigerians—has been proved wrong over and over again. Too often U.S. faculty have brought "made in America" solutions to overseas problems.

We easily forget that the developing countries need to *adapt*, not to *adopt*. Their deepest desire is to fashion a system which fits their

---

*The Educational Record, Winter 1964. Copyright 1964, American Council on Education.

needs. The United States borrowed heavily from European educational systems but created a distinctively American system. So the developing countries today are determined to choose from the world stockpile of knowledge about the organization of educational systems. The Asians, the Africans, the Latin Americans are all proud peoples; they want an Indonesian, a Nigerian, a Colombian education system—one which is fitted to their culture, their aspirations, their economy.

Our task is to help the developing countries fashion their own unique, individual systems. Neither our junior college, nor the land-grant college, nor American-brand student personnel services can be packaged for export. Nor does it make sense to export the expensive technology of North American physics, chemistry, engineering, and medical laboratories to universities which cannot possibly afford them. The scientist from our country who goes abroad must learn to make do with more modest tools. Computers are not appropriate in universities that lack the kind of minimum equipment found in any good high school laboratory here, nor are books and other tools of learning of value unless there are competent professors to plan their use. Our own experience here at home should make it evident that a university is a living organism; diagnosis and treatment must be directed to the foreign university as a whole, not to its separate parts.

Our universities have a distinctive, vitally important contribution to make to the development of modern educational systems in the underdeveloped world. The Government must think of the universities, not as contractors selling specialized talent on demand in an essentially commercial transaction, but as valued partners in the foreign assistance program as it relates to education. I would suggest two distinctive roles which U.S. universities ought to play in the developing countries.

First, our universities can help the developing countries shape an educational strategy to govern its investment in education. This is a task which must precede all others. It is not enough to tinker with bits and pieces of an educational system. Comprehensive analysis is required if scarce dollars for education are to be prudently invested, if the reform of education is to be systematically approached. No single discipline within our universities can have a monopoly on this demanding new assignment.

Instead, we must call on the combined talents of many different specialists. The demographer and the statistician must project enrollment trends; specialists from our colleges of education must analyze testing systems, selection systems, philosophies and technologies of education; social scientists must analyze the institutional framework; and economists must address themselves to the economics of education. What *is* an appropriate educational system for a country with a per capita income of only $300? Is the goal of universal primary education really feasible in countries everywhere? How can an emerging country prepare enough high-level manpower to operate its governmental system? What is the role of specialized manpower in triggering economic growth?

These and other questions require intensive analysis and imaginative approaches. Surely here is a task of analysis for which our strong universities are uniquely fitted.

Second, our universities can be enlisted in the task of modernizing existing universities in the developing nations. These universities are painfully aware of their own inadequacies. They badly need help, and they turn eagerly to U.S. universities as sympathetic colleagues and natural allies. A charitable gift of books or equipment is not likely to accomplish much. Nor is the occasional visit or teaching assignment of a foreign professor. A more fundamental, more enduring relationship must be hammered out. The thoughtful scholar in a Colombian university, for example, wants access to new knowledge; he wants to become a part of the world of scholarship; he hungers for human contact with his professional counterparts in other parts of the world. Our colleagues overseas need sympathetic consideration, not gratuitous advice.

In the task of modernizing a university in the developing countries, what better resource have we than the U.S. university? A strong and confident U.S. university can marshal an impressive array of talent for the task of institution building; it can proceed slowly, patiently, flexibly. Indeed, it can proceed in no other way if good results are to be achieved. Quick results are not in the cards; we must not think in stop-and-go terms or be content with short-range objectives. In strengthening the Latin American university, for example, I am persuaded that to think in less than 7- to 10-year perspectives is to risk failure.

The costs and contributions of assistance

If U.S. universities were to be more deeply involved in the foreign assistance program, what would be the cost? I do not mean money costs, for the Agency for International Development must expect to pay full costs for services requested and performed. But what of the additional burden on faculty resources already strained by heavy commitments here at home? Surely we need to think this question through very carefully.

My own answer to this is simple and unequivocal. The U.S. university that accepts a contract with AID must be satisfied that the task contributes to its own strength and intellectual vitality. Otherwise the university *does* become a merchant of skills, or—as some critics have put it—a "hiring hall."

Overseas assignments can be intellectually challenging and rewarding. Our faculties need the stimulation of overseas assignments. With few exceptions, teachers who have served abroad are convinced that a new, fresh, and important dimension has been added to their teaching. Here's what a friend in one of the Central American countries wrote recently, "It never fails to amaze me how much clearer the perspective of Stanford, universities, and the United States is when viewed from a somewhat different perspective. I think I have learned a lot and am continuing to learn." There is no lack of eloquent testimony on this point.

Everywhere the United States is confronted with restless and impatient peoples eager for better food, better health, better opportunity for a decent life. Our next generation must be immeasurably better equipped than are we to participate intelligently in world affairs. It is not enough to open our doors more widely to the foreign student. The unique contribution our universities can make is to assist the developing countries in shaping their educational systems. Happily, by helping others, we can enrich ourselves. This is the universities' stake in the developing nations. (*The Educational Record*, Winter 1964.)

Universities and the Foreign-Assistance Program

*by Robert M. Rosenzweig**

Mr. Rosenzweig is associate dean of the graduate division at Stanford University.

There is . . . an aspect of the general problem of government-university relations that is largely nonscientific in character, that is growing in importance, that raises fundamental questions about the nature of higher education, and that has had insufficient airing both inside and outside higher educational circles. The issue I refer to concerns the extent to which universities can and should participate in the continuing effort to improve the lot of underdeveloped countries.

Colleges and universities—mostly the latter—have been involved in economic- and technical-assistance programs almost since those programs began in the late 1940's. At present, according to David E. Bell, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID), 69 universities are engaged in technical cooperation projects in 37 countries, and the bill for them amounts to some $136 million. Bell states that "no two contracts are alike. In each case, the assignment is a highly specialized one which is tailored to the local situation."[1]

This high degree of specialization is not surprising, for it reflects accurately the needs of an agency that deals daily with as complex and bewildering a set of problems as any in the world. And, it should be said, with problems as important as any currently before the Nation. No matter how specialized the work in which universities are engaged, however, the opportunity to engage in it raises a set of questions that any faculty or administration with a clear view of its purposes and a sense of the integrity of the educational enterprise in which it is engaged must answer. It is not the fault of AID that these questions have not often been asked—who will defend one's virtue if one will not do it himself?—but the failure of universities to deal with them may have consequences that are very serious indeed.

What, then, are these questions? What should university policymakers ask about a project that is proposed by a faculty member, by AID itself, or, usually, by the two combined? They are a mixed bag, ranging from quite particular ones to very broad ones. Here is the way I would put them:

1. How closely, and in what specific ways, does the project tie in with a new or existing instructional program? Does it add anything to the institution's educational program?
2. Are there contractual conditions which would make the activity inappropriate for university sponsorship? Are there, for

---

*© 1964 Ohio State University Press.

[1] "The University's Contribution to the Developing Nations," *Higher Education*, XX (March 1964), p. 5.

example, restrictions on publications resulting from the work? What controls, if any, does the sponsoring agency claim over university faculty and staff engaged in the work?

3. Does the project impose a large management burden on the institution? If so, are there ways of relieving that burden without losing the benefits of the project to education and research?

4. Is the project justified, in the face of possible objections to it, solely because the sponsoring agency wants it conducted and a faculty member (or group) wants to conduct it?

5. If there are educational objections to the project, are they overridden by a claim that the work is important to the effective conduct of American foreign policy?

The five important questions posed are perhaps not an exhaustive list of those that might be asked. Two things are clear, however, from this formulation. First, these questions are not peculiar, except in detail, to the area of overseas development projects. They ought to be asked in connection with every activity—research, service, or instruction—for which outside support is sought or offered; and second, the issues are complex and sensitive and are not amenable to solution by a single expression of policy against which every proposal can be measured and automatically accepted or rejected.

With one exception, to be noted shortly, my own preference is not to talk in terms of policy, but rather in terms of a "point of view." By this I mean an intellectual posture which leads us to ask the right questions and guides us, it is to be hoped, toward the right answers—something less rigid than the *Federal Register* but more pointed than the national anthem. I shall suggest some of these questions and answers. First, though, the one exception to that approach.

Any wise negotiator comes to the bargaining table knowing which of his demands are negotiable and which are not. This maxim is as true for government-university negotiators as it is for the President of the United States at the summit. This basic rule has been violated by universities in the past, and, as matters now stand, is certain to be broken again in the future. I refer here to two matters (grouped under the second question previously listed) which are central to the integrity of a university: control by the scholar (when formal security classifications does not apply) of the manner, place, and time of publication of the results of his research; and control by the university of the assignment of faculty and staff, with its corollary, protection of them from arbitrary action by outside sponsors. In my view, there are not negotiable issues; but there have been instances—and there is no reason to believe they are uncommon—in which both of the prerogatives were negotiated away.

To be specific, one agency operating in the international area has insisted on its right to approve or suppress any publication resulting from the research it was sponsoring during the life of the contract. This was an improvement over the agency's original insistence that it have the right to alter or suppress at any time any publication which it deemed "contrary to the foreign-policy interests of the United States." A restriction of that kind should be unacceptable to any institution that cherishes the values of free scholarship. My quarrel is not so much with the agency which demands such power as with the university which concedes it.

So, too, with a second invasion of university prerogatives which I can cite. A contract currently in force between a university and a government agency (indeed, perhaps, all contracts with that agency) contains the following provisions:

1. No individual shall be sent overseas by the university without prior approval of the agency.
2. After consultation with the university and on the written request of the agency or of the cooperating government, the university will terminate the employment under the contract of any individual thereunder.

It is hard for me to see how any self-respecting business, much less a university, can accept conditions of this kind. In the absence of any procedural safeguards or standards for agency action, and on the assumption not of bad faith or malevolent motives but simply that a conscientious government official is doing his job as he sees it, here are some possible actions to which the university is liable: The agency decides that Professor X is not competent to do the job planned for him or that his political views are not acceptable. The agency decides that Professor X, for reasons of personality, politics, or anything else it deems important, is no longer wanted in the country in which he is working. After "consulting" with the university, it terminates his contract on the project. If it is argued, as it has been, that these are, after all, extreme examples and that no agency would operate in that manner, then the answer is that it does not need the power that permits it to operate in that manner. Fundamentally, no university should concede such power to an outside agency. Certainly, none would think of doing so with respect to activities on its own campus. This is a principle that should follow the flag.

To the extent, of course, that the conditions I have mentioned are matters of general agency policy rather than *ad hoc* conditions for particular contracts, there may be little that a single institution can do except decline to be involved in work that carries such restrictions. It is hard to see how, in good conscience, it can do less. No doubt, a few such refusals would be the best lever to use for effecting a change in policy.

Questions like these are really very easy if one is confident of his principles and is prepared to endure a little pain in their behalf. Much more difficult, however, are the considerations involved in what I am calling a proper point of view concerning the university's role in economic-development work. Here we confront competing principles of apparently equal worth, each cloaked with at least the appearance of academic tradition and respectability.

One must start somewhere, however, and my point of view starts with a premise about the nature of universities; namely, that they are unique social institutions. They are the only entities in our society that combine the conduct of fundamental research with the training of students to the highest educational, technical, and professional levels. In a university the two are, or ought to be, inseparable, for research informs instruction and instruction renews research. There is, literally no other set of institutions that can perform these tasks *together*. While some do not understand it, few seriously dispute the value of this unique blend of functions. It follows that anything that destroys the university's capacity to perform its functions is in principle bad, for in so doing it subtracts a social service that is irreplaceable.

With that as guide, what can we then say about activities that divert the university's resources from the pursuit of its central purposes? Since we are not seeking mathematical formulas to guide decisions, it cannot be said that activities of that character can never be undertaken. What can be said, and what I propose as a guide, is that there is a presumption against them, that the presumption is refutable, and that the burden of refutation rests on those who propose the activity.

Agreement among universities on even this minimum statement would be a major step toward more rational use of university resources in the international arena. Agreement among universities, however, must wait on agreement within universities, and at most institutions that stage is not near. Indeed, as we move from the generality of my proposed guide to a consideration of some specific kinds of activities that are in fact diversionary, and to some rebuttal arguments on their behalf, the likelihood of disagreement grows ever greater. The hard questions will not go away, though, no matter how pleasant it would be to avoid them, so let us turn to just such a consideration.

In my view, an overseas activity diverts university resources if it (1) fails to provide opportunity for the meaningful participation of graduate students; (2) takes a faculty member away from campus for a period of time that interferes either with his classroom teaching or with his ability to provide his students with consistent and timely supervision; or (3) imposes a major management burden on the university, whether paid for or not.

The first of these diversions violates what I take to be a minimum requirement. If a proposed project does not provide research and training opportunities for graduate students, there is a heavy presumption against its appropriateness for any university. Some institutions might want a direct feedback into their undergraduate programs, as well, but that a project should contribute to some part of the institution's educational program is beyond dispute.

The second diversion is more difficult to deal with. Some universities are already so accustomed to having key faculty on leave as often as they are on duty that it may seem unfair to impose restrictions on leave of absence in this area of work alone. So be it. There *is* a general problem here, and the fact is that the problem is more serious when a professor is out of the country than it is when he is in Washington or New York. It should be understood that the problem is not simply one of finding a replacement to cover a man's courses, although that alone can be difficult. Even more difficult in a university is assuring graduate students a reasonable degree of continuity in their programs. When a professor leaves the campus for 2 years, it is no consolation to the graduate student doing a dissertation with him to be told that somebody else will be covering the man's courses. Anyone who has administered graduate programs can attest that this is a serious and growing problem. Whatever adds to its extent harms the university.

The least serious of the three diversions is that having to do with administration. If faculty discourse is to be taken at face value, most professors dislike administrative chores, and they dislike equally the growth of bureaucracies on their own campus. They should take as jaundiced a view of those developments when they accompany overseas projects as they do in others areas. Yet it should not be beyond our intellectual powers to devise arrangements that will permit universities to derive educational benefits without assuming large management responsibilities. The point is that institutions should be wary of those burdens unless they are very certain that the benefits of the project outweigh them.

I have said that it is arguable whether the practices to which overseas activity sometimes leads constitute an abuse of university resources. Of the two chief arguments in refutation, one is most likely to come from the agency which wants the work done and the other from the faculty member who wants to do it. To state the Government's argument first, the university is likely to be told that the national interest requires that a given piece of work be done, and that the best available resources for doing it reside in the university. As likely as not, both parts of the argument are true. Still, I confess that I have great difficulty with the conclusion that is presumed to follow; namely, that the university should undertake the work. Partly, my difficulty is practical, for I have seen projects and policies justified as being in the national interest that have not the remotest connection with university purposes, values, or atmosphere. Partly, too, however, my difficulty is conceptual; the argument is just too arid for my taste. It is too often made *in vacuo*.

Let us grant that it is in the national interest to assist in the development of stable nations with values congenial to ours. What then of the national interest in maintaining universities strong enough to perform vigorously their irreplaceable functions? Surely these two considerations need to be weighed against one another. It is the duty of public officials to promote that part of the public interest for which their office makes them responsible. But it is equally the duty of university faculty and officers to promote that part of the public interest which is in their charge. There is no reason to assume that the two always coincide or that the latter must always yield to the former. To put the matter bluntly, it is neither narrowminded nor unpatriotic to argue that this country needs the undiluted strength of a good university as much as it needs a good teacher-training program in east Africa. My own belief is that in the long run other institutions can be created to perform that part of the economic and social development function that is not congenial to universities, but that there are not and cannot be other institutions that perform the functions of the university. The alternative agencies, with a few exceptions, do not exist yet. They never will exist so long as Government agencies can induce universities to undertake all manner of tasks, whether they contribute to educational goals or subtract from them.

The second major argument in refutation is that a member of a university faculty is free to pursue his professional interests wherever they may lead him, and that it is an infringement of his rights as a scholar for university officials to inhibit that freedom. This is not a serious overstatement of the way in which the argument is often put. Clearly, this is a very sensitive issue within any faculty that prizes its independence and integrity. And properly so, for the decision to hire or retain a faculty member should be understood by all to be a vote of confidence in his professional ability and in his competence to judge where the frontiers of his discipline lie. Most important, this is a principle which universities must maintain at all times in the face of pressures on faculty from outside the institution. There is still a question, however, whether the principle applies with equal force when the restraints at issue are internal ones designed to promote the corporate values of the institution. The issue, in this sense, is not whether the scholar is free to do what interests him, but whether the university is obliged to sponsor—to provide a home for—whatever interests its scholars may have.

Within limits, the answer to the question, so phrased, is yes. But surely it is not yes in all cases and under all circumstances. For example, universities might well refuse to sponsor certain kinds of weapons development work or the development of products whose chief benefit is to a commercial enterprise. Similarly, it is both rational and appropriate for a university to refuse to endorse a project which would not contribute to, or would reduce its ability to achieve, its educational objectives. This is clearly an area where wise officials will step very softly. But to deny their responsibility for such judgments entirely is to argue that a university is simply a plot of land on which a group of autonomous scholars live and work in greater or lesser association with students when and as the spirit moves them.

If the foregoing is correct, then its obverse is equally true: If a university is not obliged to undertake any activity its faculty urges, it is bound not to undertake any activity which the faculty who will be affected are not enthusiastic about. One of the dismal sights in American higher education is that of administrators scrambling for contracts for work which does not emerge from the research or teaching interests of their faculty. The result of this unseemly enterprise is bound to be a faculty coerced or seduced into secondary lines of interest, or a frantic effort to secure nonfaculty personnel to meet the contractual obligations. Among the most puzzling aspects of such arrangements is the fact that Government agencies have permitted and even encouraged them. Not only are they harmful to universities—which is not, of course, the Government's prime concern—but they insure that the Government will not get what it is presumably buying; namely, the intellectual and technical resources of the academic community. It is simply a bad bargain all the way around.

It should be clear by now that, in my opinion, it is extremely difficult to refute the negative presumption raised by at least several of my conditions. It may also seem that in stipulating them I have effectively argued universities out of any significant role in the whole process of economic and social development. Not so. The academic community not only has a major opportunity in this area but a major, and in the long run probably crucial, responsibility. I have not emphasized the opportunity here because it seems to me self-evident that the processes of economic, social, and political development offer some of the most exciting intellectual challenges of this century. The university which did not provide the conditions for its faculty and students to partake of this excitement would simply not be alive to the world in which it exists. The pressures on universities to provide service in the sense of operating development projects in the field are not only good but are necessary precisely to the extent that they provide those conditions.

It is the demand for service that is not and cannot be related to the needs of faculty and students that should be resisted. And the higher the aspirations of the university, the more important it is that these demands be resisted, for in the long run the crucial responsibility of universities is to do what good universities are supposed to do: teaching and research. Not only university officers and faculty, but Government officials as well, should be concerned enough to ask who will educate and train future workers in this field if not the universities. And who will do the needed research on the processes of development, if not university faculty and their students? But equally important, who will be responsible for either of these assignments if universities are persuaded to undertake tasks that divert them from these very purposes? The answer, I am afraid, is that no one will do them very well. It is hard to see how anyone's interests will then be served. (*Journal of Higher Education*, October 1964.)

The Universities and International Technical Assistance

*by Lynton K. Caldwell**

In a subsequent issue of the Journal of Higher Education Mr. Caldwell discussed some of the internal problems of universities in the administration of overseas technical-assistance contracts. A professor of government at Indiana University, Mr. Caldwell has served overseas in a number of consulting and technical-assistance assignments.

There is widespread agreement in universities and in government concerning the conditions necessary to effective contract administration. This is evident both in the literature and in the discussions that have been held from time to time under the auspices of the American Council on Education, Education and World Affairs, and individual American universities. The difficulty lies, not in agreement in principle, but in administration in practice.

That there may be gaps between highest level formulation of institutional principles and precepts and lower level interpretation and execution of policies is to be expected. The hiatus between theory and practice is no more characteristic of universities than of other human institutions. In situations where guidelines, conventional responses, and mutual expectations are well defined, inconsistency between principles and performance may pose no serious problem. But in new endeavors, where the lessons of experience have not been learned and where professional and personal values are at hazard, incoherence in institutional behavior may seriously diminish the benefits to be expected from the effort. University contracts with government for technical assistance overseas have been vulnerable to this inconsistency, and for three identifiable reasons.

First, the generally decentralized administration of American universities and the traditional custody of academic values and standards at the professional or departmental level make it difficult for university presidents or top-level deans to change attitudes and assumptions prevailing throughout the university. Methods of persuasion may be available, but the tendency is to use them sparingly, and preferably where no interference with the responsibilities of academic deans or department chairmen could be inferred. Thus it is unrealistic to expect that a university president will, or perhaps should, thrust his personal view of the university's international responsibilities upon his administrative subordinates. But if there is a pronounced and continuing dichotomy between the official position of the university and its internal practices relating to international-contract programs, faculty commitment to those programs is certain in the long run to suffer.

A second reason for inconsistency between high level principle and lower level practice in international-contract programs is found in

---

*© 1965 Ohio State University Press.

the structure of academic values and rewards. Government contracts for international technical assistance have overwhelmingly entailed training, demonstration, and consultative functions—rarely research. A major justification for university involvement in government overseas contracts has been "public service"—a function notoriously low on the rating scale of academic values. Only the most prestigious public services enhance the professional reputation of the university faculty member or the esteem with which he is regarded by his colleagues. The cumulative testimony of contract coordinators and faculty members strongly suggests that service at home or abroad on government contracts rarely earns a currency that can be traded to advantage in the academic marketplace.

It is important to distinguish between the personal growth (cultural and intellectual) that may result from overseas experience and the influence of this experience on subsequent academic status. The young academic can afford to hazard 2 or more years abroad as a contribution to his professional education. For the midcareer and senior faculty members—particularly the more ambitious in highly competitive departments and fields—the risks more often outweigh the probable rewards. The professor who returns to the university campus after 2 years of service abroad on a government contract may be, in his personal competence and insight, a more valuable faculty member than before he left. But in the allocation of promotions and recognition, his dean or chairman may find it difficult to equate his contribution with, for example, that of a colleague who remained at home and developed a continuing research grant that takes him off the hard-pressed regular university payroll and also supports a number of graduate students whose future work may bring distinction to their alma mater. Meanwhile, the returning professor may find himself drafted as academic wet nurse for foreign-student contract participants whose presence adds color and variety to the university campus, but whose intellectual contribution, in the aggregate, may be highly dubious.

The utility of government overseas contracts will not be advanced by failure to take realistic account of the facts of academic life, and it is fair to state that the substance of most technical-assistance programs offers little attraction to the type of intellectual talent that the universities and the learned professions value most. It has been difficult to persuade first-rate scholars to accept overseas assignments in which functions other than scholarship are primarily in demand. Host governments and institutions are often disappointed at the inability of American contract universities to provide top scholars for more than short-term visits. Host-country recognition that the team members on an American project are not necessarily people of prestige in their own university, and may indeed be only temporarily associated with it, does not strengthen the team's effectiveness on the job. But unless the academic community can broaden its concept of what is worthwhile and meritorious, or government contracts can include relatively unfettered and substantial research components, academic service in government overseas contracts will be a continuing problem.

The third factor in the gap between principle and performance may be laid to institutional inertia and conservatism: "Few colleges [or universities] foresee the requirements of their expanding enterprise and design the organization for dynamic administration and growth in line with stated objectives * * *."[1] They find it easier to take on new tasks than to devise new means for their execution. On behalf of the universities it must be conceded that the arrangements that meet the needs of effective oversea-contract administration have not been obvious. The devising of new organizations, standards, and procedures appropriate to oversea-contract administration would in any case require time. Universities cannot be fairly censured for caution in innovation in the early years of oversea-contract programs. But they may rightly be held remiss if they continue to involve themselves in such ventures without a willingness to make the kind of internal changes that are required to realize fully the potential benefits of these programs.[2]

Clearer and more realistic understanding, among all parties, concerning the requirements of the task is an essential condition for more effective use of technical-assistance contracts. But this more adequate understanding will have meaning only as it is reflected in positive action on the part both of Government and of universities.

This is not the place to discuss the changes needed in Government policy and procedure to obtain the best that universities have to offer. But the ability of universities to assist Government will depend in large measure upon changes in Government's ways of dealing with the universities. If Government is to obtain full commitment from the universities to the task of international technical assistance, contractual relationships must be based on the following considerations:

1. Universities cannot risk full commitment to contract programs for which Government financial and logistical support is subject to abrupt, unpredictable, and arbitrary change.
2. The duration of a program (as distinguished from the duration of a contract) should be for a period sufficient to accomplish program objectives.
3. Within the general terms of the contract, the university should be accorded a high degree of operational flexibility and of discretion in making the best use of its resources.
4. There should be a research-and-development component in every major Government-university technical-assistance contract for the purpose of cumulatively enriching national resources for international technical assistance.

The following comments may clarify these points.

The Government has often applied inappropriate standards of commercial procurement to contracts with universities for oversea educational programs. University resources cannot be purchased like paper clips or shoes, or even merely as "personal services." Government, like any other buyer, will seldom get more than it asks and pays for. Neither will it receive what its own policies and procedures prevent the university from giving. Yet obvious as these commonplaces may be, they have not thus far significantly influenced the substance of technical-assistance contracts. Where Government policy should be clear and firm, as in fiscal support, it has too often been confused and shaky. Where flexibility is essential, as in program execution, Government policy has too often been uncompromising and rigid.[3]

---

[1] Archie R. Ayers and John H. Russel. "Organization for Administration in Higher Education." *Higher Education*, XX (April 1964), p. 8.

[2] There has, of course, been innovation, particularly structural innovation, in university administration of oversea contracts. But these changes are not necessarily accompanied by changes in academic and personnel policies and attitudes. The most imaginative development so far is the Ford-financed Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan State, and Wisconsin) established in January 1964, to remove some of the more difficult barriers to maximizing the academic value of oversea contract operations and enlarging the capacity of the universities for effective technical assistance abroad.

The length of the contract period is less important than a realistic agreement between the Government, the universities, and the aid recipients regarding the length of time needed to do the job. There must, of course, be agreement on what the job is—and too often this has been lacking. But initial agreement will be of little avail if the duration of programs is subject to the arbitrary decision of changing mission directors or program officers. Unless the Government is willing to accept a moral commitment binding—with reason—upon its administrators to see a job through, the universities have no assurance that their efforts will not be prematurely terminated and largely wasted.

Universities and the general public have too readily attributed arbitrary shifts in foreign-aid policy to congressional capriciousness, led by chief scapegoat Otto Passman. In fact, the instability of contract programs may also be explained by maneuvering and infighting among the lower echelons of the Agency for International Development (AID). Staff rationalizations of unilateral changes of policy for contract programs are then too often uncritically endorsed by only partially comprehending AID superiors.

In the foreign-aid program, notably through AID and the Peace Corps, the United States has often attempted tasks for which adequate resources did not exist. Within American universities are many of the resources indispensable to success in foreign-aid tasks. Yet few if any universities have all of the resources needed for the complex assignments that they have been invited to undertake. University contracts for oversea technical assistance, if realistically conceived, could insure a continuing growth and enrichment of American competence in the work undertaken. But Government has for years been systematically short-changing itself and the universities, living off technical and intellectual capital, allegedly for reasons of politics and economy.[4]

Unfortunately, universities have sometimes been party to their own exploitation. Short-term gains in faculty, students, and budgets have persuaded academic administrators to overlook or defer consideration of accrued liabilities. Overhead payments have further helped to mislead universities into believing that they were receiving a better deal than, in the long run, was in fact the case. The hidden costs of contract operations may not fall due for some years after contract termination. Payment may be exacted in forms not obviously attributable to contract operations—in disaffected faculty members, in books not written, in lines of research and teaching undeveloped, in investments of time and money in skills and knowledge that have no tie-in with continuing university programs or assignments. An honest total cost accounting of university contracts would not always support the argument that the contracts have been beneficial to the university. In any case, an adequate evaluation must take into account the probable outcomes of other lines of development that contract programs displaced.

---

[3] There have been indications of a more realistic consideration of university needs by AID, notably in discussions at the July 1964 conference on International Rural Development sponsored by AID, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges; in the AID proposal to develop a new standard contract for university programs reflecting recommendations of the Gardner report; and in the statement by AID Director David E. Bell, "The University's Contribution to the Developing Nations," *Higher Education*, XX (March 1964), pp. 5–8. But past experience has indicated that broad policy commitments are narrowly interpreted at operating levels. The meaningful policy is the one actually applied.

[4] But cf. Roy P. Fairfield, "The Peace Corps and the University," Journal of Higher Education, XXXV (April 1964), pp. 189–201.

The foregoing comments by no means indicate a writeoff of any real university benefit from Government oversea contracts. Whether a particular contract can be fairly said to have benefited a particular university or department or faculty member depends upon a multiplicty of factors. And the judgment is always relative. Moreover, we have no balance sheet that can be relied upon to list all of the debits and credits that might be charged to these contracts. One may believe, as the writer does, that university involvement in the oversea contracts has, in the main, been justified. The broadening of intellectual horizons, the jarring of academic complacency and provincialism, the discovery of improved methods of teaching and learning, may offset the damage done to academic standards and to the professional careers of certain individuals.

But however one balances the accounts to date, a conclusive report cannot be rendered because the books have not been closed. The ultimate justification of the universities' involvement in the contract programs will depend heavily upon what happens now—upon whether the experience of a decade in technical-assistance contracts can be developed into a continuing, mutually beneficial Government-university relationship. That this can be done is the conclusion of the Gardner report. If it is done, a number of changes will be called for within the universities.

By this time, any university with experience in oversea technical assistance contracts should have understood the demands that these programs make upon it. Perhaps the No. 1 need in universities continuing to accept oversea contracts is some system of insuring adequate and realistic appraisal of the contract and the program before signatures are affixed. This appraisal, in addition to a careful examination of the oversea situation, should also include examination of the university's interests and resources, its long-range objectives, and the implications of its involvement in the program.

It is especially important to avoid contracts to which key deans or department chairmen concede only grudging or tacit approval. When the inevitable rough weather of contract administration arrives, their indifference or lack of support will make life even rougher for the contract program. This disapproval will be manifest in ways to which objection cannot easily be made. "Standards" will be upheld without exception, "rules" applied as literally stated, and university fiscal and personnel policies narrowly interpreted; as a result, the harassed contract staff will be placed in the position of importuning for special and dubious dispensations.

In defense of deans it may be argued that they should not be asked repeatedly to approve departures from established rules, standards, and procedures just because someone thinks that oversea contracts are a good idea. If the contracts are of sufficient importance to the university to be accepted, their importance is surely sufficient to warrant whatever changes in university organization, policy, or procedure may be necessary to their execution. Unless the policy-determining authorities in universities are prepared to recognize that the requirements of international technical assistance programs differ from those of traditional academic activities, they should put aside consideration of Government oversea contracts or be prepared for inadequate performance and inevitable controversy.

An important aspect of the art of maximizing success in the oversea contract programs lies in knowing what to integrate into the university and what to segregate from other university activities. Unless the general purpose and substance of the program are related to regular and continuing interests in the university, its impact is likely to be minimal and its achievements largely fortuitous. There must not only be the possibility of feedback into university teaching and research interests; there must also be provision to insure that this feedback occurs. A university is not ready to begin contract operations until it has laid down a set of policies and procedures to maximize the intellectual payoff of the program to the university, its faculty members, and its students.

These measures include identification of how and in what ways teaching and learning are to be facilitated through the program. On the assumption that the university will not normally accept a contract lacking a research and development component, plans must be made to relate these aspects of the program to the ongoing research interests of faculty members and graduate students. It is especially important that there be opportunity for adequate preparation of the faculty member for oversea service, for consolidation of his field experience, and for his reintegration into stateside professional life upon his return. After a 2-year tour abroad, a relatively unrestricted semester should be available to faculty members who can show evidence of intention to make good use of it. Comparable provisions should also apply following contract services by faculty members on the home campus. All of this implies a close relation between the substance of a contract and the academic programs and departments of the university, including the libraries, language instruction, and area studies.

Segregation of contract activities is necessary with respect to logistical operations, direction of the overseas program, and counseling of foreign student participants. Although the substance of the contracts and the professional knowledge, skills, and competences required should be germane to the interests and functions of the university, the actual operations abroad and the activities necessary to establish and maintain a staff overseas differ from what have been considered normal campus activities. Regardless of how they may be organized, the business operations of the contracts should be looked after by persons qualified to do so by training and temperament. There is no real justification for expecting faculty members to perform these functions.

Direction of the overseas program, however, must be accepted as an academic function. This function should be recognized as differing, at least qualitatively, from most other campus activities, since it calls for particular skills in coordination and communication. It is especially important that mutual responsibilities and lines of communication between university faculty and staff serving abroad and the home campus be clear and unequivocal. Inherently difficult problems of long-distance communication and complex policy decisions will become intolerably frustrating if responsibilities are poorly defined and lines of communication unclear. Some of the most trenchant and justifiable criticisms of university performance on Government contracts overseas may be laid to irresponsible administration on the home campus resulting from the university's failure to provide adequate organization for contract administration or clear delegation of authority to a project director who is backstopped with top-level administrative support. On more than one university campus, high-level indifference and internecine jealousies have been responsible for the lack of real stateside guidance in contract operations.

The special needs and circumstances surrounding the foreign student participant also call for special arrangements. When a university contracts to accept and train certain foreign students and agrees to share their selection with authorities overseas (over whom it has little control), it has laid itself open to some potentially troublesome and exceptional student personnel problems. It often proves impracticable to integrate contract students directly into the student body of the university. Characteristically, a preparatory period is needed before university study—particularly graduate study—it attempted.

Overseas contracts will strengthen academic programs and personnel most effectively (1) when the contracts are directly related to the university's clearly recognized interests, (2) when the distinctive needs and implications of contract operations are taken into account, and (3) when the contracts are fully utilized and administered as opportunities for the long-range intellectual enrichment and growth of the university.

The shortcomings of university contract administration are largely those that might have been expected in the unfolding of a new aspect of higher education. But enough is now known concerning the ways in which Government-university partnership in international technical assistance can be improved to increase accomplishments materially. If the lessons of the past decade are reflected in a realistic and developmental handling of contract programs, they should afford enlarging and enriching opportunities for university education in the future. (*Journal of Higher Education*, May 1965.)

The World Role of Universities

by Edward W. Weidner[*]

Mr. Weidner, now director of the Center for Developmental Change at the University of Kentucky, was formerly involved in the overseas programs of Michigan State University. While there he compiled "The International Programs of American Universities" and wrote "The World Role of Universities," published in 1962.

In most cases American universities participating in technical assistance projects overseas have set no objectives at the home campus. Most of the impact at home has been accommodative—that is, adjusting administratively and otherwise to a project—rather than substantive. Offices of project coordinator have been established, secretarial and other personnel hired, lines of authority designated, and sometimes advisory committees set up.

Few other changes were planned for or introduced, for example, in regard to teaching or the pattern of courses and curriculums. Faculty members returning from abroad have normally gone back to teaching the same courses as previously, perhaps introducing some new examples but yet covering the same subject matter. If several members of a department have gone abroad, not much of their teaching load can be concentrated on the few courses directly related to their overseas experience. In many subjects, too, teaching abroad and in the United States is fundamentally the same; no regional aspect is present.

Within the humanities and social sciences, area studies are most intimately related to host countries and their problems. Strangely enough, area studies at American universities have not played an important role in most technical assistance programs, and few area studies professors have gone abroad under them. This is largely due to the fact that technical assistance has been requested in many subject matter areas but not in regional or host country studies. The overseas programs have been a major factor in developing a comparative approach in some fields, such as comparative education or comparative public administration.

In most fields outside the humanities and the social sciences the nature of the subject matter precludes the introduction of many geographical considerations in courses at the American university. The call for courses in medicine, engineering, or agriculture on a regional basis is not great enough to induce many institutions to specialize in them, and the wisdom of such specialization at the home campus is open to question. Tropical building engineering was a specialty encountered by the staff members of Northwestern University in the Sudan, but few students at Evanston would be interested in it. However, examples of problems encountered in building in the tropics have become more frequent in courses at Northwestern conducted by faculty members who served in the Sudan. On occasion, overseas programs have contributed something to curriculum in colleges of medicine or agriculture. Thus the School of Tropical and Preventive Medicine of the College of Medical Evangelists has a program in Tanganyika which gives faculty members valuable field experience for courses back home. In agriculture, where the host-country geography and climate are similar to that encountered at the American university, experimental work of advantage to the American institution can be carried out. However, American professors have introduced at home very few practices of host-country universities.

---

[*] From "The World Role of Universities" by Edward W. Weidner. © 1962. Used by permission of McGraw-Hill Book Co. No further reproduction authorized.

The main effect of the projects on American students has been to deny them access to certain professors while the latter are serving overseas. In a broad sense, of course, experience abroad adds to the richness of the professor's background. On occasion, graduate students have participated in the programs and this has sometimes been of special value to them. However, few institutions have used the programs to give graduate students an opportunity to pursue specialties or collect data for theses. Only three of the programs in the Latin American sample did so. The University of Chicago used its program in economic development in Chile to involve American-based graduate students and faculty members. Some graduate assistantships have been available on home campuses in connection with technical assistance programs, but they have often been held by students with no special interest in the program. California wished to expand its Italian program in public administration to include research in Italy by American graduate students, but financial support was lacking. The Harvard nutritional experts were unsuccessful in furthering their research objectives through their project in Peru.

The general impact of the programs on American university campuses, though usually not a formal objective, has occasionally been real. A single program is likely to have more effect on a small campus than on a large, sprawling university. If a large university is going to marshal its international resources, it must do so in more ways—through an international faculty, a substantial number of foreign students, and individual as well as group exchange. However, institutions as large as Nebraska and Oklahoma State have found it possible to use their technical assistance programs for making contributions campuswide and even communitywide and statewide. Turkey and Ethiopia have become the focus of much attention in those States. Oklahoma State has even gone so far as to have annual Ethiopia days. Prominent Oklahomans from all over the State come to Stillwater. One of the features of the occasion is a large banquet, usually addressed by some prominent Ethiopian—the Emperor himself in 1955. The general impact of the programs at home has been enhanced in several instances by extension personnel at land-grant colleges.

These are exceptional examples. For the most part, little systematic use is made of the experience abroad of returning professors. Most professors observed that few of their colleagues seemed to care about their overseas experience. Some had not even been asked to speak to any campus group. Community talks were, if anything, more frequent than campus appearances, in part because certain organizations were always looking for speakers, and university speakers bureaus provide a liaison. Wives of staff members gave a number of community talks. In the case of programs that had been underway for some years, those first returning often made some appearances, but those who followed later found that the saturation point had been quickly reached.

Influence on American campuses has been surprisingly small. While inadequate financial support for special activities was responsible for some of the lack of impact at the home campuses, a more general obstacle was that the programs were not normally closely tied in with other academic interests or with the regular academic departments. The Cornell-Liberian program, though successful in accomplishing its objective, providing a code of laws for Liberia, w[illegible]ot of concern to anyone at Cornell beyond those immediately involved. The Pennsylvania research program in Mexico, which involved technical assistance, was not tied into the activities of the University of Pennsylvania at home. Most programs have affected only a minority of the members of any one department. They are not central to the day-to-day thinking or problems of most academic personnel.

Part of the impact of the programs on American universities has been evident as the programs or their goals have been expanded or contracted. More and more American universities have been willing to engage in the programs. Those institutions that have participated in one have often been willing to take on another. Some institutions have developed reputations at home and abroad as international- or technical assistance-minded universities.

Some projects have been expanded beyond the intention of the originators or have contributed to lasting cooperation between two universities. The Texas A. & M. program at Antonio Narro was discontinued formally, yet the two institutions are still cooperating informally. In the University of Michigan training program for Mexican operators of heavy equipment, a relationship to the program in Ann Arbor was at first envisaged. It was felt that—

> * * * the Mexican center could serve as a laboratory for teaching methods in vocational schools; experience there could be transferred to the United States scene with, it was hoped, considerable economies resulting in vocational training at home. This objective was completely lost; if there was any experimentation it is not reflected in the reports, and there was no coordinated plan for using the Mexican experience in U.S. schools. Furthermore, the two deans envisaged the project as an opportunity to establish rapport with other Mexican institutions which could in turn lead to the establishment of programs "at a higher academic level," but this objective, too, apparently was abandoned. * * *

Some of the technical assistance programs have reinforced the language competence of faculty members directly involved and given them more specific understanding of another culture and more international involvement. Impact on their family and profession was also observable. Most of the professors considered going abroad an advantage for their families, although this varied somewhat with the post to which they went, the age of their children, and general family adaptability.

While a majority of faculty members who have been abroad do not see any immediate professional gain and a number of professional losses in the time spent overseas, at least a minimum of professional impact has occurred in most instances. Individual faculty members have published articles and books on subjects related to their overseas assignments, when their experience was relevant to their specialties. Foreign experience has been advantageous to professors seeking new opportunities abroad, and administrators of the programs have also qualified themselves for other job opportunities.

All international exchange programs of American universites extract a price. Manpower is scarce, and the time and energy that any individual has to devote to professional pursuits are limited. A professor abroad is making no contribution at home. The use of personnel resources is costly, and the returns must equal the cost if the overseas programs are to be considered successful. The present project did not examine the many alternative activities in which professors might engage. However, unless the innovations achieved by the technical assistance programs are substantial, they will not be worth the cost. No program in which desirable innovations barely outweigh the undesirable is likely to be a wise investment of personnel resources because of the sacrifices of alternative uses of the personnel.

Long-range values cannot be measured after a few years of experience with technical assistance programs abroad. Observers and persons directly participating feel that programs with modest results are worth the cost. They point to the necessity of gaining experience and to the fact that many of the objectives to be achieved cannot be quickly realized. Most programs of American universities are products of the 1950's. Perhaps by the 1970's [illegible] will be possible to measure their effectiveness in achieving long-range results.

Most of the shortcomings in the programs can be attributed to inexperience by all concerned. It is necessary to recognize and overcome these defects. About half the universities encounter serious difficulties in their programs during the first 2 or 3 years. Some programs are discontinued, others improved. Rarely has a university been asked to leave a country before its contract expired, as happened once in Cuba. Most programs of longer than 5 or 6 years' duration are able to meet many of their objectives with an economy of resources. They also are able to choose objectives more realistically. It may be unwise for universities to engage merely in short-term, isolated projects.

Professors from England, France, the Soviet Union, and other countries are engaging in many technical assistance activities, although in a form somewhat different from the program device used by American universities. They, too, have made mistakes. For example, the Soviets have erred in sending some poorly qualified people to India in engineering, England has erred in not responding to urgent calls for help from certain South American countries, and France has sometimes sent its second-best professors abroad. No university system has a perfect score. However, if American universities wish to continue to make contributions to and receive benefits from technical assistance programs, it would be well for them to remember that they have no monopoly. If they fail to profit from their experiences of the 1950's and greatly to improve their programs, they may find that doors will close, that others have taken up a good share of the responsibility for technical assistance abroad and the benefits flowing therefrom. (*The World Role of Universities.*)

American Professionals Overseas

by Irwin T. Sanders

As the outgrowth of a Ford Foundation-sponsored 1963 conference on "Preparation for Professional Practice in Technical Assistance Programs," the foundation granted funds to four U.S. universities to look into academic specialists' views of themselves and their roles in technical assistance programs. Irwin T. Sanders, associate director of the Ford Foundation program in international training and research, commented on the progress of the project in three papers given during 1965. These papers were adapted and published in brochure form in 1966.

Today thousands of people from the developed nations are engaged in programs of technical assistance in the developing countries. Unlike those who went abroad in earlier times as traders, colonial administrators, missionaries, and military personnel, these are a new body of people going abroad, not primarily to promote a cause or a creed, but to share their technical knowledge and skills as these are needed by countries that are trying to move to greater economic, political, and social security.

Our knowledge of what the U.S. academic professional—the engineer, agriculturalist, educator, or social scientist—does abroad has been incomplete. Much has been written on cultural shock and social adjustment abroad, but little about the professional role of the American in technical assistance. In what way is this role similar to or different from customary practice in the United States? What new demands are made? What implications do these demands hold for professional school training, for selection procedures, orientation programs, allocation of available personnel to specific jobs, supervision and evaluation in the field?

In recognition of the need for further information on this subject, the Ford Foundation granted funds to four universities to make exploratory studies. These were to be based on interviews with American professionals who had returned from overseas work and who were immediately accessible. The studies have now been completed. They do not claim to represent a scientific sample, nor are their findings considered definitive. Instead, they suggest interesting leads and shake some commonsense assumptions.

The studies were conducted at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies by Leonard J. Fein; at the Pennsylvania State University by Clarence E. Thurber, George M. Guthrie, and Richard M. Spencer; at the University of Massachusetts by C. Wendell King and Edwin D. Driver; and at the University of Southern California by William B. Storm and Jason L. Finkle. Despite overlap among the professional groups surveyed, there were distinct differences. The MIT study primarily concerned engineers (academic and nonacademic) and scientists. The University of Massachusetts study focused on teachers in the social sciences and humanities, mostly from colleges in western Massachusetts, who went abroad individually rather than as part of technical assistance teams. The Penn State study covered agriculturalists, education specialists, and engineers who took part in technical assistance missions; and the University of Southern California covered these groups and social scientists as well.

A total of 451 people were interviewed. Not all were asked the same questions, for each university team, though aware of what the other three were doing, developed its own study. Since a variety of methods were used to secure information, the results need to be interpreted with caution; however, some general conclusions are possible.

Why They Decided To Work Overseas

While none of the studies was constructed to probe motivation in depth, they did offer informants opportunities to identify some of the factors they thought influenced their decision to work overseas.

One strong theme which emerges is service. Three-fourths of the USC informants rated as important "an urge to help people in need of my technical knowledge," and 67 percent similarly rated "a desire to be of service to my country in its relations with developing nations." This tendency is also shown in other similar studies.

A highly qualified picture emerges about "professional" motives. Almost three-fourths of the USC group rated "the professional challenge of the assignment" as considerably or greatly important. Only 25 percent so rated "an opportunity to do research and writing," and only 22 percent so rated "overseas experience had become important in my professional field." The Penn State study showed 53 percent of their informants agreeing that one of their main purposes was to aid development of their careers—but by implication 47 percent had no career advancement in mind.

Personal reasons—volunteered by 83 percent of the USC informants, and also evident in the Penn State and University of Massachusetts studies—tended to cluster around positive, developmental aspects: "a desire for change, adventure, foreign travel," and interest in other peoples and places. Few attached importance to such negative motives as getting away from life's complexities, dissatisfaction with job or income at home, or domestic difficulties. Financial motives were significantly absent from Penn State responses, and although listed in the University of Massachusetts study, were far outnumbered by responses indicating desire for personal and/or professional development.

The importance of institutional recruitment pressures—urging or orders from academic superiors—as opposed to the attractions of the job is less clear. The USC study, which dealt largely with professionals who worked on university-operated technical assistance contracts, found that 56 percent say they were "recruited," and 39 percent say they "volunteered." But the University of Massachusetts study, heavy with professionals in the humanities who seldom went abroad on behalf of their own institutions (rather making arrangements through the Fulbright program, under the Smith-Mundt Act or with grant-making agencies) showed 40 percent "volunteered" and 40 percent "recruited." Also, the line between recruitment and "volunteering" at the suggestion of an academic superior is not clear.

Satisfaction and problems

In terms of satisfactions, a highly favorable picture emerges—most dramatically in the MIT study, which concentrated on engineers and scientists. They expressed high self-satisfaction, cited few problems of adjustment to the host culture or to the job, perceived few difficulties or tensions, enjoyed or did not mind travel, and seldom doubted the effectiveness of their work. The USC group were also enthusiastic about their experience, though they were less fully satisfied with their own performance. Their associates in overseas work were, however, satisfied with it. The University of Massachusetts group showed 81 percent extremely or moderately satisfied, only 19 percent dissatisfied. Comparison of the most satisfied with the least satisfied in this study reveals that the former spent more time with host country nationals outside the work situation, experienced less culture shock, more often returned to their previous position at home, and had less tendency to criticize the predeparture briefing about the job. Penn State respondents also emphasized the importance of personal relationships, felt that personality qualifications were as important for successful functioning as professional qualifications.

Problems tended to center more often around the professional job than around general living conditions and adjustments. They related chiefly to variations in administrative practice or cultural differences surrounding work. One category of problems focused on ambiguity in the professional role. Some professionals are uncomfortable if their role is not specific and clear and its results easily measured. Others feel uncomfortable if the job is too structured. The MIT study seems to indicate that this factor is influenced by both personal and professional factors: "* * * people who (in the United States) tend to read only local newspapers, who tend to have little social-science background and place a low value on the social sciences, who have not traveled abroad * * * usually become involved in overseas assignments which are clearly structured and more bureaucratically organized, and which therefore have less ambiguous criteria of success. They also experience greater discomfort in adjusting to the new environment, and both in order to lessen the discomfort and because the organizational structure allows it, their primary contact is with other Americans."

Connections with host country counterparts or the absence of such counterparts also raised problems. Counterparts' professional backgrounds sometimes differed from those of the Americans; sometimes a counterpart's energies were divided among several jobs, of which the American's was only one. Sometimes counterparts were appointed late or not at all, and in most instances knew no more about how to work with Americans than the American professional knew how to work with them.

A third set of problems clustered around communication and participation in the indigenous hierachy. Many professionals wondered if they were getting through to the men they worked with, and if they were, often found that innovation could be initiated only from the highest levels because of excessive bureaucratic rigidity.

Finally, some found fault with project administration, which involved both fellow Americans and host nationals. While judgment on this aspect was generally favorable, it was qualified in many instances.

Career impact of the assignment, as distinguished from personal and professional satisfactions, seems to have been minimal. Benefits seem to lie chiefly in broadened professional perspective rather than in publications, academic promotion, or salary increases. Most do not feel they lost out badly, nor have they felt they advanced because of their foreign service. Some variation is apparent by field, with only 31 percent of the USC group saying they were able to publish a book or paper, but 60 percent of the social scientists in the group having done so. Only 16 percent of the USC group said their experience had a beneficial effect on their careers, with least effect on engineers and greatest on social scientists.

Differences in Professional Role at Home and Abroad

Underlying the studies was the assumption that a professional person would have to do some things on the job overseas differently from the way he would do them in the United States. The facts as presented by returned professionals do not seem to bear out this assumption as fully as anticipated.

Although the professional fields of the people interviewed lend themselves to classification in four broad categories (i.e., science and engineering, social science, education, agriculture), the actual work performed on overseas assignments was much more diverse. Most of the professionals were employed at home primarily as teachers in their specialties. Abroad, they found themselves cast additionally as administrators, consultants, researchers, negotiators, and combinations of these. Responsibilities ranged from the narrowly technical to broad policy formation.

This diversity makes generalization difficult. Yet most of the respondents said they did not see much difference between their professional role at home and abroad. In light of other responses, however, it appears that many think of the "professional role" as what might be termed the exercise of *technical competence* associated with a given specialty, distinguished from the substance of a 9-to-5 job—the *work* role—overseas. This distinction seems most sharply made in the minds of those who worked in technical assistance, where jobs tend to require more than narrow technical competence (an engineer may be asked to advise on administrative aspects of his assignments, for example). There is considerable evidence to show that Americans do recognize differences in their *work* role at home and abroad. For one thing, they say they devote relatively less time to professionally technical matters overseas and more time to interpersonal relations and other matters where variations in cultures play a part.

The studies indicate that in the opinion of those with overseas experience, some of the necessary skills in working in another culture can be taught—that selection need not be confined to those with a natural flair for dealing with people. But they do emphasize the importance of selection, particularly if those making selections understand the kind of jobs for which selection is being made. The most frequent complaint is the disparity between the job as described at home and as it existed in the field. Many say that they consider themselves the wrong kind of person for the job they were recruited to perform.

There are differences of opinion in the studies as to whether orientation for overseas assignments is best performed by experts in the host culture or by professional colleagues with knowledge of the host culture. They do indicate that effectiveness and satisfaction may be improved by careful matching, through better definition of the characteristics of the man, his training, and the overseas job.

Differences by Professional Fields

More complex differences emerge when the responses are examined by professional field. The studies tend to confirm accepted findings about variations among professions, but they also point up comparative sensitivity of their practitioners to social and cultural factors.

Engineering and Science. The first observation that emerges is that sweeping generalizations about whole professional fields should be made only with the greatest caution. This is clear from an examination of the field of engineering. Three of the four studies dealt with engineers. The MIT study is particularly revealing since it includes academic engineers, academic nonengineers (mostly scientists), and nonacademic professionals (mainly engineers sent abroad by two large consulting firms). It reveals marked differences between academic engineers and nonacademic engineers: the latter participate in large-scale engineering projects abroad, while the former are more involved in consulting and in strengthening educational institutions abroad. Over half (58 percent) of the academic scientists functioned as individual experts, not as part of any organized group effort.

There are variations in job clarity. The nonacademic engineer has a very clear picture of what he is supposed to do, as do half of the academic engineers. To most of the academic scientists the job was either unclear or they considered its full description irrelevant in advance of the overseas work. The academic engineer runs into more bureaucratic and organizational differences abroad than does the nonacademic engineer, probably because he still thinks of himself as a professor as well as being an engineer. The engineers, in contrast to the scientists, spend proportionately more time with Americans abroad (which may reflect differences in the kinds of assignments they have as much as a predilection for their fellow countrymen). But engineers of both types experience more discomforts during the adjustment period than do the academic scientists. Partly due to the specificity of their assignment, the nonacademic engineers have a much higher opinion of the host country personnel than do the academic scientists and the academic engineers. In fact, the last group has a decidedly negative view toward their counterparts' competence.

The majority of the total group considered their performance successful, with the degree of self-assurance being highest among the nonacademic engineer and lowest with the academic engineer, one-third of whom doubted the success of what they did abroad. (The number in this group is small and this conclusion must not be pushed too far without further testing.)

One of the most significant differences among the scientists and both groups of engineers concerns prior foreign travel. For approximately three-fourths of all the engineers interviewed, this was their first trip abroad. This can explain, in part, their greater contacts with Americans and more discomforts during the adjustment period. But the mental baggage which they carry on their first foreign assignment is important too. The academic people, in contrast to the nonacademic engineers, are more cosmopolitan in their outlook as measured by the kind of newspapers that they read, but then the academic-nonacademic comparison breaks down. Instead, the engineers (academic and nonacademic) show strong negative contrasts to the scientists with respect to attitude towards social science (63 percent of the latter show a positive attitude even though only 26 percent had a social science background) and the importance of learning about the new culture into which they are going as opposed to concentrating merely on the job or personal problems.

From the Penn State study, the following profile of the engineer, as distinct from the other field, can be drawn: They felt no major problems in communicating with the host nationals; fewer (but still a two-thirds majority) thought knowledge of historical and cultural background of operational value, and fewer thought adjustment of professional techniques necessary. Furthermore, they saw their foreign assignment as a direct extension of their work at home, requiring little shift in thinking to more concrete matters. They also found the people with whom they worked well prepared in the area of the U.S. engineer's specialty.

The Penn State study and the MIT study also show that the academic engineers were primarily engaged in consulting and not in supervision of projects. They saw little need for preparation for the foreign assignment beyond that for engineering in the United States. They view adaptations to foreign situations as based on judgment and experience, not on formal instruction. Also, the overseas experience has less impact upon their professional careers than it did on careers of specialists in agriculture or education.

The University of Southern California study dealt with 40 persons in each of the 4 professional fields considered here, or 160 in all. Of 144 statements which the informants were asked to rate, 15 were answered by engineers in such a way as to set them at one extreme to a degree that is statistically significant. They showed that engineers thought more than the other professionals that their marital relationship had *not* suffered from the experience, that their religious convictions did *not* interfere in their professional and social relationships overseas, that they could maintain high professional standards in technical assistance work, that generalists do not operate better abroad than do those highly trained in a specific field, that people in the U.S. technical mission thought that what the engineers did was worth while and important, that the U.S. Government interferes in too many activities, and that many of the host nationals' problems would be solved if they would work harder. Although engineers disagreed with the statement: "My job overseas presented little professional challenge," their disagreement was less marked than the social scientists and educators. They tended to agree, but to a less marked extent than other fields, that excessive bureaucracy and redtape were characteristic of the country in which they served.

Other findings about engineers in the USC study were the following: Engineering and social science sent professionals of higher academic rank overseas; engineers and agriculturalists started going overseas some years before education specialists and social scientists; engineers had reached the lowest educational level of the four fields; engineering and the social sciences had a high number of short-termers, but even so engineers are more inclined to call the term too long while agriculture had more long-termers and was least likely (along with education) to have a qualified person as counterpart.

But engineers in the three studies differed in their responses, as groups, to several factors. Among them: the importance of knowing the local language, and criticism of host country counterparts. These facts suggest that engineers from different institutions may carry with them differing attitudes and expectations about job requirements and the importance of working with host counterparts.

Agriculture.—The outstanding fact about agriculture as shown in the Penn State study is its middle position between engineering and education on most matters. But there are several items where the agriculturalists represent one extreme, with engineers usually representing the other.

Agriculturalists more than education specialists and engineers thought that the overseas experience would help their careers, though only 54 percent of all agriculturalists felt so. Fewer agriculturalists than those in other fields thought that the host nationals gave a clear picture of the reasons for their behavior. Even so, 69 percent of the agriculturalists thought they had acquired sufficient understanding of their hosts. The host nationals impressed more agriculturalists than other professionals as being involved in political problems in their own bureaucracy, and as having little idea of what kinds of help the professional offered to them. Agriculturalists felt more handicapped by the social-political conditions but rated the role of climate in underdevelopment lower than did the other two professions. They also got less help from reports of their predecessors, were not as aware of treating people differently abroad, saw more disadvantage of technical assistance work in having a high degree of knowledge in a specific field, and felt a little more keenly the necessity of getting down to more concrete matters in the foreign assignment. As for benefits gained from the experience, the agriculturalists were able to add new materials to courses or their work, were provided new data or ideas, and received increased recognition from professional colleagues. But in noting the differences between fields, it is important to remember that within agriculture itself these views were by no means unanimous, resulting sometimes in a 50–50 division.

Agriculturalists are far more pessimistic than other professionals—and engineers least—in their view of the impossibility of maintaining high professional standards in overseas work. They agreed with engineers that many of the host nationals' problems would be solved if they worked harder, and along with engineers tended to agree more than social scientists that the job overseas presented little professional challenge.

Agriculturalists and the social scientists are at opposite extremes on eight items in the USC study, where the social sciences are added to the three fields in the Penn State findings: Fewer agriculturalists than other professionals approved U.S. Government intervention abroad, and more felt too much was being spent on foreign aid. More felt that the host country population liked and supported their leaders, and fewer felt that popular discontent was not Communist inspired. More believed that political considerations should not influence technical assistance and that the primary purpose of technical assistance is to improve the host country's standard of living. They also felt most underpaid and least encouraged in professional growth by their team leaders.

Nevertheless, in end-of-interview restatement of the most satisfying aspects of their overseas work, agriculturalists exceed other fields in the extent to which they felt they obtained recognition for their work. Engineers felt they received the least. Also the agriculturalists rank highest in sense of accomplishment, with the education specialists considerably below them at the other extreme. Very few agriculturalists stressed the importance of self-development in the overseas experience. They did stress more than others that a desire for change, adventure, and foreign travel had been a motivating factor in their acceptance of the overseas job. Of the four fields represented in the USC study, agriculturalists were most critical of the host country professionals with whom they had interacted. The agriculturalists also place highest emphasis upon the value of knowing the language of the host country. As far as conditions in the host country were concerned, agriculturalists and engineers were more satisfied with health conditions than education specialists and social scientists; agriculturalists and social scientists were more satisfied with the transportation situation; and agriculturalists were least satisfied with primary education and housing.

Education.—One would assume that education specialists would be most apt to recognize a close connection between the cultural setting and the work they are trying to do abroad. But this does not emerge as a clearcut finding of the studies. This may be due to the fact that some education specialists sent abroad are as technically oriented around a specialty as any engineer or agriculturalist, and react accordingly. In the Penn State study only 59 percent, and in the USC study only 62 percent, of these specialists stressed the importance of knowing the local language for the success of their work. In the former study the figure is higher than that for engineers and agriculturalists but in the USC study it is slightly lower.

On the other hand, all of the education specialists in the Penn State study recognize the importance of knowing about the historical and cultural background of the people in doing their job and 91 percent felt that their competence in communication and perception was constantly being put to the test. They rated both of these items higher than did the other two professions. But this must be weighed against the fact that in the USC study education specialists ranked lowest in their indication of knowledge of, and interest in, the country where they served—25 percent as against 42 percent for engineering, 48 percent for agriculture, and 82 percent for social sciences.

The education specialists represent one extreme in a number of other items in the Penn State study: Three-fourths of them—fewer than in other fields—agree that without a lot of practical experience they could not have accomplished as much as they did overseas. More than in other fields felt that an orientation period should emphasize the religious situation; that the overseas experience made possible new professional relationships in the United States; and that this experience had changed their view about some of the professional problems faced in the United States.

Just as significantly, three-fourths of the educators disagreed with the idea that they were clearly prepared for any type of problem coming to their attention (but the majority of engineers felt prepared); and that the overseas assignment did nothing to improve their work in the United States (disagreement more marked than other fields).

In addition, fewer education specialists felt that they had been given a clear picture of what they were to do abroad, experienced difficulties with local administrators, or were handicapped in their research at home by the work abroad.

In the Penn State study, a larger proportion of education specialists than those in other fields thought the overseas experience beneficial to their professional career, and that their stay abroad was one of the most valuable experiences of their life, though the USC study shows that education specialists find the most difference between the ideal role and the actual role performed overseas, and between the expected and actual activities.

There is also an indication that educators, more than other professionals, had a desire to get away from some of the complexities of life and were more dissatisfied with their job at home. For 90 percent of the education specialists this was the first experience abroad, in comparison with 76 percent for the group as a whole.

Both the USC study and the Penn State study show greater importance given to religious factors by the education specialists than other professionals, that they felt more compatible with their American colleagues, complained of redtape in the overseas operation more, felt their counterparts committed, believed the host country population supported its government, and felt most strongly that political considerations should not influence technical assistance projects.

Social sciences.—The social sciences as a special field are taken up in two of the four studies. In each case they are in somewhat different company, since as noted earlier, the University of Massachusetts study includes primarily Fulbright fellows and many others not involved strictly in technical assistance programs, while those in the USC study were all part of university-directed technical assistance programs, which means that their role was not that of a researcher so much as a practitioner, in public or business administration, or community development.

In the University of Massachusetts study persons in the humanities and social sciences were most likely to retain their professional roles, largely teaching, in going abroad, whereas agriculturalists became involved in activities in addition to teaching. In comparison with the other fields, social scientists were disproportionately sponsored by religious, foreign, and college funds; those in the humanities went abroad almost entirely under Fulbright and Smith-Mundt grants, while agriculturalists were chiefly connected with the Agency for International Development.

As for regional preference, the social scientists sought out Asian countries to a degree exceeding other specialists. A relatively high number in the humanities claimed knowledge about the culture of the host country compared to social scientists and agriculturalists. A high proportion of social scientists and natural scientists thought counterparts were of assistance to them and cooperative, whereas the one-fourth of all respondents who complained of obstructionism by the counterparts included a higher proportion of people in the humanities and in agriculture. Only the social scientists stood out in responding that they had become better teachers as a result of their overseas experience.

The social scientists in the USC sample are compared with engineers, educational specialists, and agriculturalists. They stressed least the importance of the job to society and agreed most that faculty members should have their overseas workloads lightened to make more time available for private research, writing, or other work in their fields.

As for marital relationships, the social scientists, more than in other fields, thought that their relationships had suffered from the overseas experience. Likewise they disagreed more than others with the following statements: That the U.S. Government makes matters worse when it steps into the affairs of other countries; that the current administration is spending too much on foreign aid; that most of the popular discontent in the country where they served was Communist inspired.

They tended to *disagree least* with the following: That their overseas contract group had serious disagreements with the U.S. technical assistance mission about project goals and that the overseas counterpart organization often frustrated the work they were trying to do. Among other ideas the social scientists agreed with less often than other fields are the following: The population of the country where they served supported and liked its government and leaders; that people in the U.S. technical mission were well aware of the social scientists' activities; that political considerations should not influence technical assistance projects; and that the overriding purpose of technical assistance should be to improve the standard of living of the host country.

Social scientists are in extreme positions on two additional statements. They agree that bureaucracy and redtape seem more characteristic of American Government operations overseas than in the United States, and that their counterpart organization was quite committed to the goals of their overseas project.

Social scientists apparently bring very different perspectives to some of the problems encountered abroad than do many in the professions centered around material-technical operations: 78 percent of the social scientists were Democrats compared with 35 percent of the education specialists and engineers and 25 percent of the agriculturalists; social scientists are more likely to read magazines featuring comment and less likely to read picture magazines or popular reviews. They are most likely in the United States to read major prestige newspapers, and their reading is much more public affairs oriented.

Fewer social scientists (62 percent) before going overseas were on the faculty of the university sponsoring the contract than the agriculturalists (85 percent). More social scientists published in the period covered (1959–64) than other professionals and considerably more drew on their overseas experience in these publications. When the professional people are asked to list the occupational values identified with the ideal job, the social science group proved the most variant, stressing self-development, but laying less stress on good locale, living conditions, and friendly personal relations. Social scientists, along with those in education, encounter most difference between the actual and expected job overseas.

When asked about the importance of various reasons for accepting the overseas job, the social scientists laid less stress than the other professionals on "an urge to help people in need for my technical knowledge"; stressed "an opportunity to do research and writing in an area of interest to me"; and also emphasized, with education, "a desire to be of service to my country in its relations with developing countries." Social scientists also showed most interest in and knowledge of the country where they served in contrast to the other three fields. It must be remembered that the social science category used in the USC study includes many in administration and management, as well as in economics and finance.

Questions for further study

From the foregoing, we see that engineers and social scientists often, but not always, are at different ends of the continuum of attitudes about features of overseas work. Somewhere in between we usually find agriculture and education, not always in the same order. A much fuller exploration of the reasons for these relative positions would require study on the work sites themselves, since factors which the professional person himself may not fully recognize may be operating. Indeed, professional training of any sort, whether in engineering or public administration, may actually serve to desensitize the practitioner to the point that he is much less perceptive about the social situations in which he finds himself, especially those in another culture. It also leads to the question: What is uniquely American about the practice of a given field and what is universal or broadly applicable?

In every profession, it is possible to distinguish between principles or theory, and techniques or practice. To a greater or lesser extent, the principles may well be universal, but techniques or practices in some professions may need to be adapted to different requirements in each locale. Is the relative parochialism in personal interests and attitudes of the engineer or agriculturalist caused in part by the fact that some of their professional principles are universal, and, therefore, they can function without as much need to adapt to local cultures as other professionals? Or is parochialism related to something quite apart from the generality of technology and procedures?

The majority of the people surveyed in the four studies expressed substantial satisfaction with their own performance in both the professional and work-role sense, but question whether their colleagues share this opinion. A full 90 percent of them say they think they did a good job. Yet the testimony of Congressmen and other observers of overseas development undertakings say the picture is not so bright. This raises the question: Does self-satisfaction with professional performance reflect objective conditions, or does it spring from the fact that for many professionals overseas, their technical competence was the only sure thing they could bring to bear on the job? That is, lacking in many cases full knowledge of the language, customs, bureaucracy, and other characteristics of the host country (and, therefore, not able to accomplish as much in objective terms), they still felt that their technical performance, if not their overall accomplishment, was good? Or is the response a defensive gesture replying to an inferred threat to their sense of mission or a questioning of their competence as professionals?

Is, in fact, the academic professional in technical assistance able to perform more competently, and in what respects, than nonacademic personnel engaged directly for overseas work?

These questions are only a few of the many which are raised by these exploratory studies. To answer them, we must learn more about what the professional actually does overseas, as distinguished from his view of what he does. If the answers are important enough, the next step in obtaining them will be the initiation of studies of professionals on the job abroad. (*American Professionals Overseas.*)

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The Role of Education in Developing Societies

by Adam Curle

Mr. Curle is director of the Center for Studies in Education and Development at Harvard University. From 1959 to 1961 he occupied the chair of Education in the then-University College of Ghana, where he delivered the following address as his inaugural lecture:

There is a kind of depressing logic about the way in which the social elements of underdevelopment combine to perpetuate each other. Winslow writes, in a book concerned with the economics of health, that "poverty and disease formed a vicious circle. Men and women were sick because they were poor: they became poorer because they were sick, and sicker because they were poorer."[1] Another authority sums up similar arguments with the simple proposition that "a country is poor because it is poor."[2] * * *

The enemies of development are separation and inequality, but if progress in one field simply leads to regression in another, and larger one, what can one do? How can one break out from the sphere of circular causation? How, in short, is development to be achieved? Quite obviously a large part of the answer concerns things we either do not know or cannot do—otherwise all societies would already be developed. A most powerful impetus toward development comes from the achievement of national independence, but how to keep up the pace once the original excitement has abated; what fixative should be applied, so to speak, to pride, ambition, and hope? But one part of the answer which we do know and can apply, is education. In fact I would go so far as to say that in modern conditions what Rostow called "take off" cannot be achieved without considerable educational development ("Take off" is his term for "the great watershed in the life of modern societies * * * when the old blocks and resistancies to steady growth are overcome. The forces operating for economic progress * * * expand and come to dominate the society") * * *.[3]

I personally would express the vicious circle by saying that countries are underdeveloped because most of their people are underdeveloped, and that when people are underdeveloped national institutions acquire a form which impedes progress and the growth of egalitarian policies. Education seems to me the most effective way of developing people. This is expressed forcibly in the Pakistan second 5-year plan. "The essential goal must be to provide an informed leadership, a responsible citizenry, and to train manpower. It is through the advancement of education alone that these goals can be reached. No uneducated community has progressed far in the modern world, and no educated com-

---

See p. 464 for footnotes.

munity with initiative and leadership has remained backward. An illiterate society clings to customs, traditions, and outmoded practices; it resists the forces of change which stimulate the acquisition of new knowledge and new skills. Training of human beings in all fields of endeavor is essential if a breakthrough is to be effected from a state of chronic backwardness, and the country is to move rapidly forward toward the attainment of the desired social and economic goals." [4]

Inadequate administration, the inequalities and social laminations leading to inadequate administration, consequent inability of the country to overcome its difficulties and the resultant isolation of the illiterate, noncontributory masses—these are all problems to be attacked from many angles but problems, surely, which will only be solved by massive investment in human beings.

Although referring to the "affluent" rather than to the underdeveloped society, Galbraith remarks that the "first and strategic step in an attack on poverty is to see that it is no longer self-perpetuating. This means that the investment in children from families presently afflicted be as little below normal as possible." He goes on to say that "poverty is self-perpetuating because the poorest communities are poorest in the services which would eliminate it," and concludes by saying that the principal limiting factor is "overwhelmingly * * * our failure to invest in people." [5]

The two obvious forms of investment are health and education. Both clearly are indispensable, but I give primacy to education because it is more fundamental. Health measures, indeed, must to some extent fail without an education to train the practitioners, and without an education which will give the lay men and women some elementary understanding of such matters as nutrition and hygiene and some appreciation of medical care and advice: I remember that friends in Asia attempting to combat cholera, found the greatest difficulties in getting the epidemic under control because the people did not know enough to grasp the appropriateness of the precautions they were asked to take.

The most obvious importance of education is that it produces the people to do the jobs upon which development depends—the scientists, the agricultural experts, the engineers, and all the others necessary to material growth, as well as the administrators, businessmen, teachers, lawyers, clerks, and other who are equally essential in creating the framework within which development occurs. Importing scientists or sending nationals away for training, however necessary or desirable, can never supply the number and depth of range of trained personnel essential to an effective development program.

But the significance of an educational program does not so much lie in its direct and immediate contribution to development works, vital though this is. It lies rather in its general raising of the human level, and in drawing people away from social and intellectual attitudes which make all growth impossible. A critical spirit, a view beyond the next village, objectivity replacing blind identification, these are the qualities education should inculcate, qualities which may be applied to any problems, whether technical, social, or moral. It will, of course, be a remarkable education which achieves any of them to a great extent, but an almost equally unusual one which achieves none of them

---

See p. 464 for footnotes.

at all. It is upon the gradual emergence of the educated, critical, creative mind unfettered by sterile traditions and cleavages that development depends. The underdeveloped countries, through the very attributes I have tried to describe, are naturally lacking in minds both flexible and empirical. Consequently they have failed to develop the types of flexible and empirical organization which are absolutely indispensable to their growth.

The emergence of a strong middle class, and the gradual infiltration of the administration from top to bottom, from principal secretary to clerk, by educated persons, will go far toward creating the social revolution which *is* development. But there is perhaps an even more seminal role for education in the whole process of national evolution. Education, if spread widely and without discrimination, is the greatest force in the world making for equality. Obviously if confined to children of the elite it can only perpetuate class distinctions, but education given to the children of the poor, the backward, and the hitherto neglected, is a dynamic force making for positive change. I would emphasize, too, that we may look for the results of establishing a school long before the first pupils have finished their education. A school is a symbol of hope whose effect upon the whole community should never be underestimated.

Having stressed the saving role of education, it must be admitted that the educational system of an underdeveloped country is subject to all the handicaps affecting development as a whole. The majority of such systems are loosely and ineffectively controlled by a weak national organization, which is capable neither of administering nor of protecting the system from those who would corrupt or use it for their own ends. There are enormous disparities in the efficiency of different schools and there may be whole groups of schools run by various religious, social, or political bodies which are in competition with each other, having entirely separate examination systems and standards of performance. Some schools and colleges may be excellent but are virutally reserved for the sons of the elite, while others are so bad as to be of no use save to satisfy a population whose ignorance is only lightened by a reverential yearning for knowledge. I would like to note in passing an interesting mechanism for preserving social equilibrium. This occurs on some of the underdeveloped countries where the best colleges demand the highest entrance standards. Though these colleges are not officially reserved for the upper classes, in fact only they can afford to send their children to the sort of preparatory schools from which they can gain the entrance qualification. In this way education, the leveling influence par excellence, may actually serve to widen the gap between the upper and lower levels of society. This indeed is bound to happen in some degree whatever the form of selection to higher education, until educational opportunity is given equally to children throughout the country.

Besides the inherent problems of an underdeveloped educational structure, we are forced to consider in addition the blowings-out and the squeezings-in, the pressures this way and that, to which it is liable once the society of which it forms part shares in the great awakening.

The first buffets are certainly salutary, jolting it into movement. Reactive nationalism, as has been termed the surge of independent spirit in the countries newly freed, or seeking equality, or both impinges at once upon education. Indeed for many people one of the main outward forms of independence is the spread of education. The cry for more schools, which has almost invariable political support—for not only is it a good vote catcher, but education is genuinely prized—is both good and bad. Schools are needed, there is no doubt of that, and the exercise of expansion is good for the administration. But all too often no one knows where to stop. It was advocated at one stage in East Pakistan that in order to get the education of the Province into a reasonable condition, 5,000 absolutely useless schools in which the teachers' average salary was about 30 shillings a month, should be closed down and the staff and funds reallocated to others which would be adequate if strengthened. This type of expansion, in which the facile erection of buildings cannot be matched by the production of teachers, inevitably leads to a disastrous lowering of standards. But this is an argument which may have little influence upon governments. The thrust of reactive nationalism is toward an assertive demonstration of equality with other countries. It leads, for example, to a greater concern for establishing institutions housed in splendid buildings, than for the less spectacular task of maintaining standards of entry to them, or of work done in them.

This is the tendency toward inflation. Almost equally dangerous and perhaps even more common is the tendency toward deflation. It may be difficult to believe, but there are still countries which differentiate between "nonproductive" development, which is anything to do with the well-being of men and women, and "productive" development, which is anything to do with the things produced by those same men and women. It is still by no means universally recognized that human beings are the most essential raw material of any nation, and that it is on their health and efficiency alone that production depends. Be that as it may, we find a remarkably widespread tendency for any country going through economic crisis to slash its budget for health, housing, education, and other things which do not in the short term, or obviously, bring in returns.[6]

Many officials of education ministries throughout the world have replied to the threat of cuts by emphasizing the importance to development of the production of scientists, engineers, agriculturists, and the like. But in this lies another danger: that the education system may be diverted to serve the immediate and tangible needs of the community and thus to neglect the long-term aim of inculcating the wisdom and judgment which will lead to a transformation of society. For, if one of my main arguments is accepted, an underdeveloped country must be radically changed if it is to achieve economic maturity. This is not reached by mere development of techniques, but by a development of society itself.

And behind this lurks yet another possibility. In the urgent desire for development, and the fear of regional and tribalistic forces which retard development, the authorities may assume such a degree of control over education, particularly higher education, as is incompatible with its healthy expansion. In extreme cases students have even been used as pawns in the political game.

I have remarked that the great awakening stirs the interest in education. But unfortunately it also offers the most dazzling open-

---

See p. 464 for footnotes.

ings to those who would be of the greatest value to the schools. In no underdeveloped country—or for that matter in many developed ones—is it easy to attract enough able graduates to teaching, particularly to teaching in the rural areas. From this point of view—and from this point of view only—the independence of former colonial territories may be deplored, for the ranks of today's leaders are filled with yesterday's teachers. Before ideals of freedom are realized, they are served in a most practical way through education, but independence brings glittering opportunities for service with which the humble task of teaching can hardly compete.

Having cursorily viewed the general social problems of developing societies, having suggested that education has an essential role in promoting that development, and having glanced at some of the specific problems of education, we must now consider how an educational system may overcome its own difficulties and contribute most effectively to the society of which it forms part. This may be thought of at three levels which I will call research, planning, and "professional."

I mention research first because, despite the voluminous outpourings of educationists—perhaps the most verbose of professional groups—we know extraordinarily little about the symbiotic relationship between education and development.[7] We know, at least I hope we know that education there must be, and plenty of it, but how much,[8] of what types, and how administered in order to attain particular goals we know not. Yet without this knowledge much of our planning is inevitably haphazard and wasteful. Our ignorance demands an intensive comparative study of the relationship between educational plans, policies and performance on the one hand, and development aimed at, achieved, and projected on the other. There is an almost unlimited field for work here. I would only suggest that the emphasis should be empirical. Indexes of growth and interaction should be sought in both quantitative and qualitative forms, and new methods refined for describing social processes

The first problem of planning, including educational planning, is to get the idea of planning accepted and to insure that it is built into the national administrative structure. This will give to an educational plan or program the necessary stability for coherent implementation, and the necessary relationship with development problems in general to give it realism.

The actual content of the plan must depend so greatly on local circumstances that I can do little more than to suggest some of the major considerations. The principle decision will concern the proportion of the national resources to be devoted to education, and here one can only emphasize that education is not a luxury: it is the very germ of growth. Then come a series of difficult choices regarding what may be termed balance. The problems of balance concern the division of resources between different branches of education: primary, secondary, university, technical, teacher training, medical, and so on. A further dimension to this problem is that of quantity and quality.

Obviously the answer found to these problems depends so closely on the existing educational structure, the supply of trained persons, the type of resources to be developed, and on the findings of the sort

---

See p. 464 for footnotes.

of research I have referred to, that it would be vain to lay down formal rules. I shall confine myself to a few broad principles affecting the role of education as I have tried to describe it. To start with, whatever decisions are taken on these intricate issues, steps must be considered for strengthening the sinews of the system: educational administration through its streamlining; and the teachers themselves through their training and their inspection, and through assistance to the development of their professional organization. This last point is of particular importance. It costs virtually nothing to encourage the establishment of institutions which will help the profession to develop as a profession, yet therefrom will emerge what is perhaps always—or do we flatter ourselves? the most soberly constructive group in society, one which is of the greatest value in its development. In no circumstances should these measures be neglected. They are the most effective means of forging an educational system with a sharp cutting edge to slice through the tangles of prejudice and ineptitude through which all development has to pass. Such steps have the additional advantage of not being particularly taxing to a country's resources, while the fact that they are on a small scale renders them less susceptible than more grandiose growths to abuse and distortion.

A broad principle which is frequently enunciated in educational planning (as in, for example, the first 5-year plan of Pakistan) is that the existing organization should be improved before it is expanded. In general this principle may be advocated, but it should be borne in mind that a nation's development is not merely a matter of economic calculation. It is affected also by such potent imponderables as pride and hope. I have already suggested that the mere existence of a school raises community morale and I believe we should be prepared to lower our standards of primary education to a certain extent for the sake of the general stimulus to development which it affords. This stimulus should create conditions of social growth in which we can eventually raise the standard once more. This cycle has been passed through in most of the economically advanced countries, but we are often overcautious in our approach to the underdeveloped ones. I would only add that in this case we should not go to the extremes of East Pakistan which I recently quoted, nor should we permit a reduction of our standards in the secondary schools. These will for some time supply the great bulk of competent persons to run the country and should be given considerable support.

I have observed that the balance of technological, professional, and general education should to a considerable extent reflect the character of the whole development program. But it is important not to be misled into oversimplifying the problems of growth. The question is not simply how to effect an improvement in agriculture, an increase in the tempo of industrialization, a more efficient exploitation of mineral resources, it is, essentially, how to create an efficient society which is capable among other things of handling these technical problems. Judgment and wisdom, therefore, should be sought as qualities of the educated man or woman no less than technical competence.

In particular we have to remember two things: First, tardiness in development is occasioned by certain social formations and their attendant attitudes of mind which can only be modified by men possessing in a high degree the qualities conferred by education; second, that the very process of development creates what I have termed interim social problems. These too must be tackled with skill and insight if development in one sphere does not simply lead to regression in another. Because the operational tools for this are such things as curriculum construction and teaching techniques, the focus of our attention should shift to the "professional" problems of education.

I would in the first place make a plea for vigorous and practical teaching of the social sciences—mainly, of course, at the university level. These provide the tools for understanding and at least partially controlling some of the more undesirable side effects of social change. Next I would stress the claims of such "useless" subjects as philosophy, literature, and comparative religion. If such subjects are considered desirable in the older countries, how much more vital are they in the newer in which, through the rapidity of change, the moral pattern is confused. In these lands much difficult rethinking on the nature and purposes of social life has to be carried out in a very short time. Third, it must be emphasized that these perplexing problems of social growth cannot be coped with by alien learning only. It unfortunately happens that developing countries are apt to acquire an ambivalent attitude toward their own culture, both despising it for being "primitive" and according it in a patriotic excess of veneration. I would like to see this redressed by making studies of indigenous culture, literature, music, art, and the like, more widespread and objective. The present unbalanced attitude means that these subjects do not contribute as they should to national growth. The local culture, whether praised or scorned, contains many traditional strengths upon which a new moral and social synthesis must be built.

Together with these three specific desiderata, some more general comment may be made upon the structure of the curriculum.[9] This is a vast topic and one which has perhaps been made fully discussed than any other aspect of education in the underdeveloped countries. The scope of education in these areas was defined thus 30 years ago. "Education should be adapted to the mentality, attitudes, occupations, and traditions of the various peoples (of Africa), conserving so far as possible all sound and healthy elements in the fabric of their social life; adapting them where necessary to changed circumstances and progressive ideas, an agent of natural growth and evolution. Its aim should be to render the individual more efficient in his or her condition of life, whatever it may be. and to promote the advancement of the community as a whole through the improvement of agriculture, the development of native industries, the improvement of health, the training of people in the management of their own affairs, and the circulation of true ideals of citizenship and service."[10]

All of this, I believe, is still valid, but it requires supplementation by a progressive boldness to counteract the slight suggestion of conservatism. In the past there has been a tendency to consider rapid change dangerous. What was desirable was a slow, steady evolution and the curriculum was adapted toward attaining it. One cannot exactly call this view rectionary. There is much to be said for it: rapid change *is*, in many respects, dangerous. But rapid change is what we have got, and the world of the 1950's and the 1960's is very different from that

---

See p. 464 for footnotes.

of the prewar decades. It is a world which presents us with problems that can only be mastered by assimilating, and as rapidly as possible, the newest techniques of the social, physical, and biological sciences.

But at the same time the curriculum must be firmly grounded in the needs of daily reality. The importance of such subjects as hygiene, home economics, and horticulture is that they are not only desirable in themselves but provide a comprehensible base from which to explore the more complex theoretical issues. Into the bargain, they establish a functional link between the educational system and the community. (Inaugural lecture, University College of Ghana, Feb. 15, 1961.)

Footnotes

[1] C. E. A. Winslow. *The Cost of Sickness and the Price of Health.* Monograph Series No. 7. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1951, p. 9.

[2] R. Nurske. *Some Aspects of Capital Accumulation in Underdeveloped Countries.* Cairo, 1952 (quoted by Gunnar Myrdal, *op. cit.*, p. 11).

[3] W. W. Rostow, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[4] *The Second 5-Year Plan 1960–65.* Government of Pakistan Planning Commission. June 1960, p. 337. In this connection, the terse statement of Tinbergen (*op. cit.*, p. 5), coming from so eminent and laconic an economist, must be given due respect: "a very important condition for development is the provision of education and training at all levels."

[5] J. K. Galbraith, *op. cit.*, pp. 257–258.

[6] An educationist, like a forester, takes a long view, but persons not accustomed to think like this understandably tend to yield to the pressure of emergency. It must be added that some politicians are concerned with the next election. The full results of depriving education may not be apparent until long after this has passed, but money saved thereby and employed with demonstrable effect may help to win it.

[7] There has, of course, been some useful work, as in *The Year Book of Education 1954* ed. R. King Hall, N. Hans & J. A. Lauwerys, London: Evans Bros. 1954. The theme of this volume is "Education and the Transformation of Societies," and it contains many important articles, but it does not tackle the central problems of the interdependence of education, and economic and general development.

[8] The recent *report of Conference on Education in east Africa sponsored by the African Liaison Committee of the American Council of Education,* Princeton, N.J. (mimeographed) 1960, remarks that "there is undoubtedly need for the expenditure of further large sums, both capital and recurrent, if the educational position in east Africa is to be enabled rapidly to meet the needs of those areas. The east African governments actually devote a high proportion of their capital and as much as about 20 percent of their budgets to education and are receiving considerable assistance both directly and indirectly from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom * * * this * * * represents a challenge to the Western World." This passage also represents thoroughly realistic thinking. The key question for research is not "how much can we *afford* to spend?" but "how much is it *essential* to spend in order to avoid the disasters of underdevelopment?"

[9] A synoptic discussion of the issue is given by Adam Curle. *The School Curriculum and Social and Cultural Tradition,* UNESCO: Paris, 1956. (Mimeographed.)

[10] *Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa* (British Colonial Office white paper) London: H.M.S.O. 1925.

Problems of Developing Higher Education in the Newly Developing Countries

by Frederick Harbison

Mr. Harbison, who is director of the Industrial Relations Section of Princeton University, is or has been a consultant on manpower and educational planning to UNESCO, ILO, OECD, AID, the World Bank, and Education and World Affairs, and has assisted in manpower and human resource surveys in Nigeria, Malawi, and Tanzania. With Charles A. Myers, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mr. Harbison wrote "Education, Manpower and Economic Growth," published in 1964, which presents a generalized concept of human resource development which may be used by economic, political, business, education, and manpower planners. The following paper was delivered by Mr. Harbison at a 1964 conference on "Education and the Modernizing of Nations" which was sponsored by the Commission on International Education of the American Council on Education and Wayne State University, Detroit.

In the modern world, there are rich nations and poor nations, advanced countries and underdeveloped countries, newly developing economies and stagnant societies. How does one distinguish between them? For the most part, the distinction is made by relative comparisons of gross national product per capita. An advanced country such as the United States has a GNP per capita of over $2,500. An underdeveloped country such as Tanganyika has a GNP per capita of about $60. There are "statistics" for nearly every country which might enable an ivory tower analyst, with the aid of a computer, to rank all the nations of the world on continuum based upon quantitative statistics which purport to measure material wealth.

But even in this age of high-speed computers, it is essential to distinguish between "the statistics" and "the facts." Our economic statistics are far from prescise. For example, there are figures of GNP per capita for nearly 100 countries, but in only half of these has there ever been a population census. And even in a country such as Nigeria which has had several censuses, there are problems. In 1953 the census showed that there were about 32 million people in the country. Just 10 years later, in 1963, the census showed that there were over 56 million. It is more than possible, in my judgment, that the political scientist rather than the demographer can give the best explanation of this record-breaking increase in population. And then who knows how to measure GNP in a subsistence economy, where little cash is used and trade consists of market women swapping beans for corn? Thus, in measuring economic growth, there is still lots of scope left for the artistry of intuitive judgment.

But even if there were good GNP per capita statistics, there are other, and perhaps better ways of measuring the relative advancement of modern nations. Why not, for example, rank them according to the relative development of their people? In the final analysis, the real wealth of nations is best measured by the skills, the knowledge, and the capacities of their human resources. For in every country the active agents of national development are human beings—not natural resources, nor material capital, nor holdings of foreign exchange.

In a recent study, Charles A. Myers, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and I have attempted this. We have ranked 75 countries in the world according to a series of human resource indexes. Our statistical information, to be sure, is very poor. But the basic idea is sound. People, after all, are the generators of progress, or the organizers of stagnation. Here are some of the human resources indexes which we used:

	Correlation with GNP
Teachers per 10,000 in population	0.76
Primary school enrollment ratio	.67
Secondary school enrollment ratio	.82
Higher education enrollment ratio	.74
"Composite index"	.89
Scientists and engineers per 10,000 population	.83

But, let's not be confused by statistical correlations. If we took other indexes and related them to GNP per capita, we could get equally startling coefficients, i.e., beer consumed per capita, toothbrushes, soft drinks, and so on.

It is obvious, however, that there is a very significant relationship between economic growth and educational advancement. This conclusion squares with the facts as well as with the statistics. But, there is no clear-cut causal relationship between investments in education and economic or national growth. To be sure, education does contribute to growth, but growth also makes it possible to expand and develop education. Education, therefore, is both the flower and the seed of economic development.

Since most of us here are engaged in education, it may be appropriate to say something about our "industry." Education is indeed one of any nation's biggest businesses. In the United States, for example, it employs nearly 3 million people—more than the steel, auto, electrical manufacturing, and aerospace industries combined are able to employ. In the Federation of Nigeria, about 125,000 persons are employed in education, a figure exceeding the combined total of employed manpower in the modern sectors of all industry and commerce. In nearly all newly developing countries, education employs between a fourth and a third of the entire stock of high-level manpower. Education is big business in any country. And it plays a pivotal role in national development in all nations.

As a big business, education can be productive or unproductive. It can waste resources as well as use them for progressive purposes. For example, a large proportion of primary school attenders never go beyond the second grade and fail to achieve or retain even minimum literacy. Money is frequently wasted on preemployment trade schools which fail to provide training in the types of crafts which are most needed in the economy. Universities may turn out graduates who are "overeducated" in terms of the employment they must accept. And in some cases, the costs of university education in newly developing countries are excessive because of duplicating faculties, lavish expenditures on buildings and housing, and student bodies of less than optimum size. To be sure, in most of these countries it will be necessary to increase the proportion of national income which is spent on education; but it is even more important that the money already allocated to education be spent wisely and efficiently.

American educational institutions are today involved in many programs of assistance to the newly developing nations. We have something to contribute, in people if not also in ideas. Indeed, those of us in education— as members of one of the largest and most critical of industries—have perhaps the central role to play in assisting the newly developing nations in this age of revolution of rising aspirations.

In thinking about the contribution which we in American education can make, it is important to understand the problems of the newly developing countries and the critical choices which they will have to make. Unless we have some understanding of what they face, we may give aid which is harmful rather than beneficial—indeed, in some instances we have been doing just that.

The newly developing countries are certainly aware of the importance of education for national development. Their aspirations are high, particularly in Africa.

At the same time the financial and human resources available for education are limited. With few exceptions, the newly developing countries export primary products for which world markets are not expanding rapidly, and they are increasing their consumption of imported products whose prices are rising. Population growth rates are also rising. In Venezuela, for example, the annual increase in population is close to 3.5 percent. Many other countries in Latin America and some in Asia and Africa have rates of increase of 3 percent. Practically all newly developing countries must contend with an annual increase of 2.5 percent. This means that, for practical purposes, nearly half of the population in newly developing countries is less than 15 years old. Imagine the problems posed thereby for educational development. Unemployment, particularly among primary school leavers, is rising at an alarming rate, even in countries with relatively high growth rates. In most it is rapidly becoming the No. 1 human resource problem.

In order to speed economic growth in a race with unemployment and population growth, most countries have formulated rather ambitious development plans. And in nearly every case, these plans call for very substantial external aid for roads, ports, dams, schools, teachers, and factories. One African country which I visited this summer is counting on "external sources" for 80 percent of the capital funds targeted in its development plan. Many more countries are counting on external resources for about 50 percent of their capital requirements. If, as is likely, 50 to 75 developing countries play the same game, the available funds from all external sources may amount to only a fraction of their combined requirements. As external aid becomes more difficult to get and as development plans become more ambitious, the revolution of rising aspirations may turn into a revolution of frustration, disappointment, and rising resentment. Indeed, in some countries real trouble is now brewing, particularly in those where actual development performance is significantly behind planned objectives.

Obviously, the newly developing countries cannot have all the education they want or need. They cannot give top priority to 20 urgent needs all at once. It is imperative that they develop a plan—or a strategy—of human resource development with clear-cut priorities. It is essential that they eliminate waste in educational investments. They must make hard choices. The aid-giving nations should recognize this. Aid is essential, but it is even more essential that it not be given for frivolous purposes. In aid giving, advanced countries should help the recipient countries build a sound strategy of human resource development. They should concentrate aid on urgent and strategic projects—and refrain from selling projects of secondary importance to somewhat baffled ministers who are often bewildered by the keen and sometimes cut-throat competition between the givers of aid.

Therefore, it is poor policy for any university in America to undertake a project in an underdeveloped country without thoroughly examining the totality of needs in the country and appraising the critical contribution which it may be able to make. If it fails to make such an assessment honestly and objectively, then it is likely to waste this country's valuable human talent and to frustrate rather than to promote the development of the country which it seeks to help.

What then are some of the problems and needs of the newly developing countries, and what choices must they make in building viable strategies of human resource development? Before turning to the choices, it may be well to examine the manpower requirements of the nations involved. In order to make our discussion more concrete, let us take as examples the countries of sub-Sahara Africa as examples.

The African countries are faced today with two basic manpower problems. The first is rising unemployment and underemployment, particularly in the urban areas. The second is the shortage of high-level manpower to carry forward national development. Let us discuss only the latter since it is specifically related to university development.

For assessment purposes, high-level manpower is usually divided into two categories:

1. The senior category, which comprises persons in occupations normally requiring a university degree or its equivalent. In this category we customarily find engineers and scientists, agriculturalists, doctors, veterinarians, graduate teachers, lawyers, diplomats, journalists and writers, and persons in higher managerial and administrative posts in both public and private activity.

2. The intermediate category, which comprises persons in occupations normally requiring 1 to 3 years of education beyond the school certificate (0-level) or its equivalent. In this category we normally find engineering technicians, agricultural assistants, nurses and medical technicians, laboratory technicians, supervisory and executive personnel, and teachers for primary and secondary schools.

In African countries, the requirements for high-level manpower have there basic components:

1. *The requirement for expansion of activities.*—This is related to the pattern and rate of economic growth, and usually rises and falls with increases or decreases in GNP.

2. *The requirement to replace expatriates.*—This is determined by the number of foreigners in high-level manpower positions and the desired rate of their replacement by Africans.

3. *The requirement to replace normal attrition.*—This is related to life expectancy, retirement, emigration, and so forth. Normally, it amounts to only 2.5 to 3 percent of existing stock per year.

In the countries of East and Central Africa (Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, Zambia, and Malawi), the requirement to replace expatriates will probably constitute for the next 5 or 10 years over two-thirds of the total high-level manpower requirement. The same is true of northern Nigeria. In Ghana and in the southern regions of Nigeria, however, it may constitute less than one-third of the total requirement since the process of Africanization is far more advanced.

As a rule of thumb, the rate of net accumulation of high-level manpower for expansion of activities is calculated at 1.5 times the increase in GNP. Thus, if GNP increases by 4 percent per year, high-level manpower for expansion should increase by about 6 percent per year.

Another rule of thumb is that the rate of increase in requirements for the intermediate category is greater than for the senior category. In most cases, the stock of persons in the intermediate category should increase twice as fast as GNP. In contrast, the rate of increase of all employed manpower in the modern sectors of African economies is usually less than one-half of the rate of increase in GNP. I should like to emphasize, however, that these rough ratios are used only as target-setting devices and are in no sense accurate forecasts or predictions of manpower requirements.[1]

From the preceding analysis, one can easily see that high-level manpower requirements depend largely on the rate of economic growth and the extent and anticipated rate of Africanization. But there are important exceptions. The requirements for doctors are related to stated social objectives rather than to GNP, and to a considerable extent, the same is true of requirements for teachers. It is also important to remember that the requirement for Africanization may vary by sector. Normally, the government services are the first to be Africanized, followed by private industry and commerce, and finally by secondary and higher education. But let us not be concerned at this point with methodological detail. The main point to be stressed is that manpower targets can be set and are increasingly being set by planning organizations, and therefore educators should pay attention to them.

From an analysis of available manpower assessments in a number of African countries, one may make the following tentative generalizations:

1. In terms of numbers, teachers constitute by far the largest requirement in both the senior and intermediate categories. At the very minimum, about one-third of all university graduates should enter the teaching profession, and an equal proportion of those in intermediate postschool certificate institutions should be preparing for teaching as a career. Naturally, these proportions will vary according to the situation in particular countries. In nearly all African countries, however, the requirement for teachers, particularly gradu-

---

[1] In practice, manpower targets must be expressed in terms of major occupational groups—for example, engineers, administrators, teachers, agriculturalists. The methodology of occupational target setting is rather complicated and need not concern us here. For further elaboration, see Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers, *Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1964, chps. 9, 10.

ate teachers, tends to be underestimated both by planners and by students in choosing future careers.

2. For every person in the senior category about three persons are needed in the intermediate category. Or, to put it differently, in most African countries three persons are required in the various subprofessional categories for every university graduate. Unfortunately, in most countries the output of the intermediate institutions tends to be below target while that for university graduates is more likely to be on target or even in advance of target. Consequently, many African countries are rapidly approaching the point where further university development must be given a lesser priority than expansion of intermediate education.

3. In the senior category, the most critically needed graduates are: first, agricultural scientists and veterinarians; second, other types of scientists and engineers; third, doctors and dentists; fourth, graduate teachers; and fifth, statisticians and economists. The demand is less critical for graduates in the arts and humanities, law, and other social sciences, although the capacity of African countries to absorb persons with such education is still quite large.

Administrators and managers are also in critical need. But they are not "produced full blown" by universities. Senior administrative and managerial posts are frequently filled by scientists and engineers. In other cases, these top positions are filled by persons with less than university education. In short, managers and administrators are produced in employment, and they come from a wide variety of educational backgrounds. In most African countries, one might expect that between one-half and two-thirds would actually be university graduates.

4. The time is rapidly approaching when university graduates in the nontechnical fields will be unable to enter senior positions in the government service upon graduation. The southern regions of Nigeria are now entering this stage. The nontechnical graduate who is not inclined to enter the teaching profession must be prepared to accept employment, at least for a time, in intermediate occupations for which he may consider himself to be "overeducated." This situation should be stressed by counselors in secondary schools, and an attempt should be made to channel more secondary school certificate holders into intermediate level educational institutions.

5. With respect to teachers, the greatest demand now and for years to come will be for persons competent to instruct in mathematics, agricultural science, general science, and technical subjects related to engineering. This means that technical subjects must be given the highest priority in teacher education.

6. In all categories of high-level manpower, the building of competence is as much related to employment-connected training as to pre-employment education. Institutes of public administration are needed to upgrade members of the civil service. Advanced management training programs are needed to improve the administrative and managerial ranks of private enterprises. Teachers need refresher courses and seminars on new educational technologies. Technicians as well as engineers and scientists must continuously study to keep up to date in their respective fields. And hundreds of thousands of adults can benefit from basic education and literacy programs. Indeed, the high-

est immediate returns in human resources development are won by improving the performance of persons who are already employed. And in the long run, continuing education and training is essential for the building of a highly productive labor force.

7. There is mounting awareness in the African countries of the need for research institutes, particularly in agriculture, animal husbandry, marketing, and distribution processes, as well as in new technologies of education. Such institutes are quite large users of high-level manpower, particularly scientific personnel with postgraduate training. And the application of research findings requires very large numbers of extension workers, particularly those with training at the intermediate level.

8. Finally, as African countries travel the road toward industrialism, the private sector tends to increase its employment of high-level manpower whereas the jobs available in government tend relatively to decline. In Nigeria, for example, the public authorities now employ about 60 percent of the country's high-level manpower. In 10 years' time, however, the private sector is expected to increase its share from the present 40 percent to well over 50 percent of the total. (The shift is even more pronounced if we exclude from government its largest and most rapidly growing sector—education.) The institutions of higher education should take this shift into consideration in designing their curriculums and orienting their students. The notion that the primary function of a university is to produce senior civil servants is already obsolete for modern African nations.

The generalizations just presented apply mainly to Africa, and indeed are subject to modification in particular African countries. A parallel set of generalizations for Latin America, or Asia, or the Middle East would be somewhat, though not entirely different. The main point to be stressed is that in any assessment of needs for building a strategy of educational development some such analysis of manpower requirements must be made.

Let us now turn to the critical choices which must be made by the developing nations. Here again, in order to be more concrete, let us take the African countries as examples.

A. *The allocation of educational opportunities.*—In Africa the opportunities to acquire higher education are scarce, and the rewards to those who complete it are great. The educated African enjoys high pay and prestige and occupies the major command posts in his country. But, his nation and his fellow Africans make large sacrifices for his education. As President Nyerere of Tanganyika said to Parliament when introducing the development plan to his people:

> Some of our citizens will have large amounts of money spent on their education, while others have none. Those who receive the privilege therefore have a duty to repay the sacrifices which others have made. They are like the man who has been given all the food available in a starving village in order that he may have strength to bring supplies back from a distant place. If he takes this food and does not bring help to his brothers, he is a traitor. Similarly, if any of the young men and women who are given education by the people of this Republic adopt attitudes of superiority, or fail to use

> their knowledge to help the development of this country, then they are betraying our Union.[2]

Most Africans must be supported in universities at government expense. Thus, the government in effect allocates opportunities for higher education. The question then arises: What criteria shall govern the selection of those to be supported? Scholarships and bursaries may be allocated—

1. On the basis of *intellectual capacity* as measured by aptitude tests, examinations, and school performance.
2. On the basis of *the country's manpower needs*, with preference for those wishing to enter critical occupations.
3. On the basis of *regional*, *tribal*, and *political considerations*.
4. On the basis of various combinations of the above.

In making the proper choices, governments must strike a delicate balance between the interests and desires of the individual and the needs of the state for national development.

Until very recently, little systematic attention was given to manpower needs. But as countries progress with manpower assessments and the establishment of national manpower boards, greater emphasis will be placed on this factor. Indeed, Tanganyika has already started a program of allocating bursaries for university study, both at home and abroad, on the basis of manpower requirements.

There are also important choices to be made regarding the aggregate amounts to be allocated to support of students in universities versus support for those in intermediate educational institutions. Here again, because relatively few Africans have the means to support their own education, governments which appropriate and allocate support will have farflung influence on the composition of the student population and hence the longrun pattern of development of African higher education.

B. *Opportunities for study abroad provided by foreign donors.*—Many foreign governments provide oportunities for Africans to study abroad. Indeed, in some African countries the number of fellowships for foreign study provided by external donors exceeds the number provided by the home government. Here several difficult policy issues arise:

1. Should students be free to accept offers for study abroad without the approval of their home governments, or should they be required to have prior consent from their governments?

2. If prior consent is to be required, by what criteria should permission to study abroad be given: (*a*) Unavailability of particular kinds of training in the home country? (*b*) duration of required period of study abroad? (*c*) political or tribal considerations? (*d*) effect upon alinement or nonalinement with foreign powers? (*e*) expressed desires and aptitude of individuals?

3. Is it appropriate or possible for the African governments to tell foreign donors what kinds of offers of educational opportunities will be accepted or rejected?

In practice, African governments have had little control over foreign offers for study abroad. For the most part, they have benefited from foreign assistance in this area. But in some cases their best students have been lured abroad, making it difficult for the local institutions to attract the best talent. And in other cases, it has been difficult to get students who go abroad to come back in reasonable time to their home countries. In any case, an African government which attempts to build a rational policy for allocation of its own educational oportunities will inevitably have to build as well a coordinated strategy for accepting or rejecting offers for study abroad by foreign countries. It will encounter strong personal and political pressures. But the choices which are made will have a vital bearing on the building of African universities.

---

[2] From address by President Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, to Parliament, May 12, 1964.

C. *The concept of the role of the university.*—The most basic choices in building African higher education lie in the role to be played by the universities in national development. At one extreme, the universities may play a very narrow role, limiting themselves to university-level education at high standard, to preemployment rather than continuing education, and to basic research. Or, they may extend their sphere of influence downward and outward to encompass intermediate education, applied research, extension services, and adult education.

I have already mentioned that in most African countries three persons need intermediate education for every one who has a university degree. I have also referred to the need for research institutes, and for various programs of continuing training for those who are already employed. In this connection, let us look at some very important but thorny questions:

1. Should higher teacher education be the responsibility of special institutes or the universities?
2. Should educational research be conducted primarily by institutes or by the universities?
3. Should the ministries of agriculture be responsible for agricultural research, or should the universities assume the major role in this field?
4. Should universities engage in agricultural extension (as they do in many advanced countries), or is this a function of government?
5. Should the technological institutes be separate from the universities (and indeed be tempted to raise themselves to university status) or should they be associated in some organic way with the universities?
6. Do the universities have a role to play in public administration and advanced management training, or are such activities best left to specialized institutes?
7. Will the universities through social science research organizations play a leading role in the actual building of strategies of national development, or will they stand aside and let Government ministries do the job?

If the universities choose to play a narrow role, they must also be resigned to limited financial appropriations. Although the provision of university education is vitally important, the development of intermediate education and applied research must now be given higher priority in most African countries. On the other hand, if the universities play too broad a role, their energies may be so scattered as to prevent operation at high quality in any field. Universities may choose to be on the periphery or the center of national development. The nature and extent of their involvement present choices which are indeed difficult to make.

D. *Economic versus sectional factors in university development.*—Universities are very expensive institutions, and small universities with many faculties are economically wasteful since they cannot benefit from economies of scale. The cost of university development in Africa could be reduced by interregion and international integration of university faculties. However, national, regional, and political considerations are often as important as economic factors in determining where universities shall be located and what faculties they shall develop. Nevertheless, growing economic stringencies with consequent shortage of funds for new university development are likely to force hard choices upon African nations in the near future. Realistic educational planners, therefore, cannot escape careful consideration of the issues involved.

The governments of all newly developing countries are faced with critical choices in allocating limited funds for human resource development. The choice areas in Latin America, or in Asia, or other parts of the world, are somewhat different from those in Africa. The essential problem, however, is the same—to build a logical strategy of development and to find the means of implementing it once it is built. As givers of aid and technical assistance, we in the United States must accept this fact. We must also understand that very few nations have built such a logical strategy, or even identified the critical areas of choice. It is therefore naive to assume that a request for assistance addressed to an American university is made in accordance with a well-worked-out plan for educational development. The time has come for careful and sophisticated analysis of how we can maximize our contribution to the development of education in the less advanced countries. We will maximize our contribution, not by any massive increase of our efforts quantitatively, not by dreaming up more and more projects, not by accepting more and more foreign students, but rather by using wise qualitative judgment and developing ourselves a more rational and logical strategy to govern our enthusiastic and well-meaning efforts to help the newly developing countries. (Paper, Conference on "Education and the Modernizing of Nations," Wayne State University, Detroit, September 1964.)

ORGANIZING FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

COORDINATION ON CAMPUS

Developing the International Office

by Joe W. Neal

During the past decade—and notably within the past year or two—universities and colleges have recognized the need for coordination of on-campus and overseas international programs. In upward of 65 institutions today there are evidences of central administrative concern for international activities in the form of either an international program office or a coordinating committee or an individual with coordinating functions. Mr. Neal is director of the international office at the University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

An international officer with the rank of a vice president or senior dean should be a member of the administration of each major college and university in the United States. Responsibility for the international educational exchange program of an institution of higher education in this country is as important an assignment as supervision of routine teaching and research activity, management of business affairs, and regulation of the student body's campus life. Coordination and direction of the institutional effort in international education is a major administrative assignment which cannot be merged with other functions or delegated to other agencies.

Higher education in the United States is the most effective projection of this Nation abroad; our colleges and universities have caught the imagination of scholars and students throughout the world as have no other aspects of the American scene. Our campuses have a capability to render services to this Nation and to humanity through participation in international educational exchange, an activity in keeping with the highest tradition and standards of the university ideal.

In order to realize their potential for international good, however, campuses must organize administratively for the function of coordinating and managing their local and overseas programs. The first step in this process is the appointment of an experienced, capable, diplomatic, and dedicated individual who will devote his personal and professional career to those campus activities which relate to international persons and programs.

Once a university accepts its obligation to designate an "international officer" (and the title itself may vary), it is faced with two decisions: the location and function of his office within the university structure. Both of these issues are apt to be mildly controversial, and a final determination of each may require the institution's chief executive to set the policy.

Where does the international office fit in the hierarchy of university administration? Immediate supervision by the president or chancellor of a college or university is a necessary feature of the international office structure. The international officer should not be in a subordinate position under an intervening administrator, for he must have direct and close contact with the chief executive, who is finally responsible for the institution's international policy.

Establishment of the international office involves consolidation of those functions of diverse bureaus, institutions, and departments which are a part of the international responsibility of the university. Many international functions have been performed in universities for varying periods of tenure since the middle 1930's. As new international involvements have arisen, however, universities have given the responsibility for these activities to different existing agencies; as a result they are haphazardly scattered throughout the university, and the effectiveness of their operation is often decreased by this separation.

Only by bringing all international program activities together under an international office can they be related to each other and clearly identified with the overall international role of the institution. Thus it is necessary to remove the programs from the agencies to which they were initially assigned. Lessening the authority of the local subordinate administrators handling these activities often creates sufficient campus opposition to block the establishment of the international office. One way to overcome these often entrenched defenders of administrative prerogatives is by appointing an international coordinating committee on which they will all be represented. Realizing the benefits of close coordination and program interrelation, these committee members will become more willing to rely upon a central administrative unit. With some relief, academicians eventually will turn their energies toward academic and disciplinary duties, leaving administration to the international office staff. This phase took 5 years at the University of Texas, and unless there is unusual cooperation among all elements, a similar period of transition can be anticipated on any major campus. * * *

FOREIGN STUDENT PROGRAMING

The education of students from other countries is the most important international service that a college or university can render. The 65,000 foreign students now in this country will soon rise to 100,000 at least, and adaptation of American universities to the needs of these future leaders of the world is one of higher education's major responsibilities.

In order to realize the benefits inherent in international education, universities must adjust their local procedures to the needs of their foreign students. Every step of the educational process, from initial communication to the continuation of alumni relations, needs constant examination and probably adaptation to the needs of current groups of individuals from abroad. Only an international office or a similar agency can influence university routine enough to accomplish the adjustments required for an effective foreign-student program.

The foreign student advising program is the first and major function which should be assigned to the international office. Foreign-student advising is generally assigned to an office such as that of the dean of students, where the function is understaffed and underfinanced. The administrative location in the counseling and guidance area further prevents direct participation in the nonstudent personnel aspects of international education. The extent of the foreign-student adviser's duties is usually limited by a division of responsibility among other agencies for such areas as admission, academic advising, and special courses.

Fortunately, however, these foreign-student advisers are, on the whole, able, dedicated, and experienced university administrators, and they frequently invest far more time, effort, and energy in their assignment than has been provided for by the terms of their appointment. They are also, on most campuses, the most knowledgeable and informed persons on international educational exchange and have closer contacts with sponsoring agencies and pending national policies than any other person in the university.

Where there is a adequately staffed and sponsored foreign-student adviser's office, this agency may serve itself as the nucleus for the new structure. It another campus international program, other than the foreign-student adviser's office, is enlarged to become the international office, there is danger that foreign-student advising may not receive the proper attention in the overall international program. Regardless of administrative origins, the new international officer must not lose sight of the primary importance of the local foreign-student program.

The head of the agency which has handled foreign-student advising may object to having this function taken over by another office. There is no fundamental need for this objection. The foreign-student adviser can continue to coordinate closely with the dean of students and all other campus offices those foreign-student activities which relate to equivalent programs for native students.

Some foreign-student advisers are reluctant to move from their present administrative location because they fear that they will lose their local "protection," and also because they fear that better career opportunities are available in their present area, usually student personnel. The "protection" afforded by a strong international officer should overcome the first hesitation, and there is no lack of career opportunity in the international field for experienced and capable university personnel.

MANAGING SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Responsibility for the operation of special international programs is another function of the international office. In fact, increasing the efficiency and improving the administrative management of these programs is one of the major benefits to be realized from establishment of the international office.

Special programs include those local and oversea projects of the university which are not a part of its regular academic routine, such as Agency for International Development (AID) contracts, programs of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, as well as programs sponsored by other national and international agencies. All these projects should be directed, coordinated, and managed through the international office. Failure to do this in the past has resulted in inefficiency, duplication of effort, spotty performance, and criticism of university participation in this type of activity.

In the area of oversea contracts there has been some campus consolidation. Campuses have appointed deans of international programs, named coordinators of contract operations, and otherwise established coordinating offices. Sometimes these offices have been confused with international office establishment. The new agency is not an international office, however, unless it also concerns itself with foreign-student advising and other international exchange activities.

Contract coordinators frequently oppose the addition of new functions. Being the elite of international educational exchange—well budgeted, adequately staffed, and senior in rank—they object to combining their operations with underbudgeted foreign-student advising and to participating in any other international educational activity which is not as adequately supported as their own contract operation. Coordinators are also usually involved in international education only for a specific period and they are usually unwilling to assume responsibility for the continuing international operations of the campus.

MORE SPONSORS FOR MORE PROGRAMS

Even though the term "special international programs" generally refers to oversea contracts financed by AID, more and more special campus programs are being developed which are financed by other sources. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU) is assigning many of its activities to universities on a contract basis. Student leader seminars and junior-year-abroad programs in Latin America, chairs of American civilization at schools around the world, and English as a second language assistance overseas are examples of the type of programs campuses conduct for CU. Since 50 percent of CU's funds come from Public Law 480 local currency, the expertise of an international officer is especially needed in their administration.

Other special programs on campus include participant training groups, international teacher development programs, Institute of International Education Orientation Centers, Peace Corps training projects, and the processing of special students sent to an American university and financed by foreign governments.

The fact that the international office handles this myriad of activities does not mean that it is all knowing in all disciplines and that the academic faculty will be excluded from international program operation. On the contrary, the successful international officer will encourage the development of international competence within academic departments and will include appropriate academic persons—to the extent of their willingness to participate—in planning and implementing programs. By relieving the academic departments of routine administrative burdens and by demonstrating to them that he can render administrative services which will allow them to concentrate on the academic aspects of the operation, the international officer can win support for his operation among the faculty members. A properly organized and functioning international office will have academic departments coming to it with plans and suggestions for international involvement, leaving up to the office the securing of funds, negotiation of contracts, and liaison with the sponsoring agency.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ABROAD

Helping to administer educational opportunities abroad for its faculty and students first became a feature of university operation with the passage of the Fulbright Act in the years after World War II. The initial request that each campus appoint a Fulbright adviser went to the graduate deans, and some still maintain control of the process. More often, however, the function has accrued to the foreign-student adviser. Fulbright advising, without budget provision and carrying little prestige or local authority, has been one of the local international activities most easily consolidated with other campus international programs.

This has not been the case with group study opportunities abroad. Junior years abroad, special seminars, and educational tours have more frequently been assigned to language departments or other campus agencies which have little involvement in the institution's total international program. The resultant failure to achieve quality has been well publicized. No other aspect of American university programing abroad has been so correctly criticized as the management of the group educational ventures. A university should have an international office if for no other reason than to operate its overseas educational program.

OTHER TASKS OF INTERNATIONAL OFFICE

Reception of international visitors and faculty is becoming a year-round activity of American colleges and universities, and this function can also best be filled through an international office. By maintaining close communication with sponsoring agencies and utilizing local and community contacts, the office can spread the benefits of these visits throughout the area served by the campus.

Also, foreign faculty members often need more assistance with immigration, housing, finance, and taxation than the host academic departments can provide. While frequently there is some reluctance to assign foreign faculty members to foreign-student advisers, there is no hesitation to take advantage of services available to guest professors through an international office.

COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

Liaison with the community is becoming an essential activity of college and university international programing. This serves several purposes. As the benefits of international education are spread through the community, the university broadens its service role. Community contributions to campus international activities, such as foreign-student hospitality and international visitor receptions, are integral parts of the overall university program. Community participation is also helpful in securing support among trustees, alumni, and government officials for the total university international role.

Experience has shown that community programs can be most effectively organized and are able to work more closely with a university when their contact with the campus is through an international office. At the same time, close administrative liaison keeps the president and his staff more directly informed about the views of the citizens of the community toward specific international programs.

Enough budget is being devoted to international activities on major campuses to support a strong international office without the allocation of new funds. Through consolidation of such operations as special programs and overseas contracts, enough administrative strength can be developed to assist underdeveloped areas such as foreign-student advising, educational opportunities abroad, and the reception of international visitors.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS EASED

Within the area of foreign-student advising, enough recognition is often not given to the additional income brought to a campus through the higher fees charged out-of-State residents and the collateral grants of sponsoring organizations. It has also been demonstrated that those colleges which have effectively organized themselves for international activities have drawn to themselves additional self-financing responsibilities and foundation assistance.

None of the above refers to the sacred realm of university overhead. But it is logical that funds received from overhead assessments should be reinvested in the administration of the university's overall international commitments.

At one time in the development of the international-officer concept, many authorities felt that the international officer should also coordinate the university's international teaching and research. The current feeling, however, is that teaching and research must continue to be the concern of academic departments, which can best perform these functions; however, the international office should be interested, informed, and available to assist with aspects of teaching and research relevant to its own area. * * *

There appears to be another surge of interest in international educational administration on many major campuses. There is growing interest in ways and means of making the most of international educational participation and of realizing the greatest advantage to faculty, students, and community of the institution's international involvement. These are local considerations. The most important responsibility of the university is still to achieve its most effective international projection abroad. It seems only logical that the establishment and maintenance of a strong international office is one way of achieving both of these objectives. (*Overseas*, April 1964.)

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Some Aspects of University Cooperation in International Education

by Stewart E. Fraser[*]

Mr. Fraser is director of the International Center and professor of international and comparative education at the George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.

From the U.S. viewpoint, 1960 may be considered as a major watershed in any study of international cooperation among universities. While the previous two decades had seen the consequences of a lack of international cooperation, as evidenced between 1940 and 1945, the succeeding 10 years would reveal the reestablishment of these cooperative relationships—usually on a one-way basis with U.S. institutions, both private and governmental, aiding in the rehabilitation of war-devastated countries. The developmental-aid era of the Marshall Plan and point 4 gave way to the International Cooperation Administration, and later the Agency for International Development. During the 1950's, the Fulbright program and the involvement of universities in overseas contracts all gave new cooperative dimensions to international education. * * *

The watershed in experimentation and the scientific development of cooperative programs in international higher education was undoubtedly the Morrill Committee report sponsored by the Ford Foundation on *The University and World Affairs.* The report analyzed and identified the various international roles of universities in the United States. It also made trenchant suggestions as to how universities individually and in concert with each other could function more effectively in international affairs and development.

The 1960's have revealed on one campus after another the concern of both administrators and faculty for developing new and/or more efficient arrangements for "interinstitutional cooperation, the working out of various patterns among colleges and universities that would permit greater division of labor, economy of effort, and maximization of results."[1] These cooperative arrangements can be graphically seen by structural and organizational arrangements made by prestigious and large universities such as Michigan State, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin which banded together in what is now known as the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities.

Other States and colleges found that they could profit by the Morrill Committee's injunction to develop cooperative relations internationally among American and overseas universities. As a reminder, here is a key suggestion from that report of December 1960:

---

[*] From *School and Society.* Reprinted by permission.

[1] Education and World Affairs, *The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities* (New York: Walker, 1966), p. xvi.

> The committee believes that the key to more effective mobilization of our educational resources in world affairs is to be found in cooperation—cooperation among universities within our own country, cooperation between them and the other institutions in our society that use and support them, and cooperation between universities here and those in other countries.[2]

There have come into existence the Associated Colleges of the Midwest with 10 institutions, the Great Lakes Colleges Association embracing 12 colleges, and, more recently, the Regional Council for International Education, also in the Midwest. It is anticipated that soon other regional compacts will be formed to promote cooperative programs in international education.

Many in southern educational institutions, concerned with the discipline, study, and programs of international and comparative education, are currently exploring the possibility of developing cooperative programs. To this end, two international education conferences have been held recently to foster cooperative relations. The first was held at the Peabody International Center, of George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tenn., in October 1964, on the theme, "Governmental Policy and International Education." The second, at the University of Florida, in cooperation wtih the College of Education, in October 1965, was devoted to the theme of "Education in Latin America." A third conference is planned for the Peabody International Center in late 1966, with emphasis on international and comparative cultural research and its implication for teacher training and the changing school curriculum. These conferences have been supported by regional institutions and by national organizations involved in international affairs such as the Comparative Education Society, the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, and the Commission on International Relations in Education of Phi Delta Kappa. The extensive involvement and encouragement of these professional associations augurs well for continued support and investment in the plans for developing cooperative relations in southern institutions for the study and development of international and comparative education.

If one requires a successful model for cooperative relations among institutions of higher learning in the field of international education, then the Pittsburgh-based Regional Council for International Education should be consulted.[3] It is a tristate compact involving 35 colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio. The services and goals of the Regional Council are, as its president, Shepherd Witman, of the University of Pittsburgh, says:

> . . . to help its members avoid . . . pitfalls and instead to build on solid long-term plans. The council's organization, activities, financial structure, and view of the future are designed within this reference. . . . The activities and programs of the council concentrate primarily on faculty enrichment assistance—to foreign students and the enlargement of the American students' international horizon. These activities have been developed and funds secured because the council could offer cooperative planning with central coordination and administration.[4]

The diverse and enriching opportunities of the regional council's program are concentrated on four major programs: a Faculty Institute for International Studies; an Orientation Center for International Students; a European-American Studies Center; and a British-American Lecturer Exchange.

---

[2] *The University and World Affairs* (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1960), p. 76.

[3] The activities of the regional council are excellently portrayed in Shepherd L. Witman, "Cooperation for International Education," *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, fall, 1965, pp. 56–61.

[4] Ibid., p. 57.

The diversity and yet skillful application of these programs is apparently involving careful planning and cooperation. The Faculty-Institute for International Studies allows a structured program of predeparture studies for faculty members, international study seminars, both at home and abroad, and assistance with individual study projects overseas. Each year a group of some 12 faculty members participate in a faculty seminar abroad; the next seminar in 1966 will be held in Yugoslavia; previously, seminars have been held in Denmark, Britain, and the Netherlands. The International Student Orientation Center has provided much needed guidance and English language services to foreign students. In addition, homes and community visits have been arranged for overseas students in cooperation with the Pittsburgh Council for International Visitors. The European-American Study Center, established in Basel, Switzerland, provides research and study facilities and orientation programs for members of council institutions. The emphasis of the center will be focused on a study year abroad program. Some 35 students from the tri-State area serviced by the council are currently taking part in its activities overseas. The faculty of the center includes both Europeans and Americans, and the language of instruction is English with classes available in French and German. The program "offers a course of instruction in the social sciences and humanities, focused upon the problems and opportunities which one faces in dealing with his traditional, political and cultural barriers. There is no problem with credits since the program is indeed a projection of each participant's own college in Switzerland."[5]

This brief account of some of the activities of the Regional Council for International Education is useful to suggest the kind of successful interinstitutional cooperation possible and the possibility of emulation in other regions. Certainly those of us in southern institutions look with great interest at the successful program of cooperative relations in international education as evidenced by Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio.

But what of the future? This account of one particular cooperative compact between three States in the United States does not but give a hint at the opportunities and tasks ahead in international education. The mention above of some of the excellent literature, both critical and descriptive, of American university involvements in world affairs is merely a hint of the extensive and often unreported cooperative relations developed by literally thousands of American academics, individually and institutionally. The Morrill committee's report of 1960 and the Education and World Affairs report, *The University Looks Abroad*, are benchmarks in any study of international cooperation among universities.

But what of the decade to come? The signposts are up and universities and colleges throughout America are continually evolving cooperative ventures. Some are stumbling, others are hobbled in their endeavors, but many are providing exciting examples of careful planning coming to fruition. The next decade ahead cannot but see a heightened interest and involvement in international education by American universities. Accordingly, it is of considerable importance to place the whole question of future international and cooperative schemes in proper perspective.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 58.

It is most appropriate, therefore, to look at the recent international educational pronouncements of President Lyndon B. Johnson. The White House Conference on International Cooperation, November–December, 1965, is being currently implemented by further Federal Government interest and involvement in international education. But what is of special significance is the fact that regional and institutional cooperation intra- and internationally is strongly implied in official statements on international education. The President's message of February 2, 1966, to Congress refers specifically to strengthening the U.S. capacity for international educational cooperation. The potential and anticipated repercussions for international education are enormous, and never in the recent history of international relations in education are expectations so high amongst those who are involved already in the fields of international, comparative, and developmental education. If the Congress can implement legislation financially, we not only will be grateful, but perhaps overextended in doing our part effectively and efficiently. (*School and Society*, Apr. 16–30, 1966.)

Cooperation for International Education

by Shepherd L. Witman

Mr. Witman is president of the regional Council for International Education and director of the Office of Cultural and Educational Exchange at the University of Pittsburgh. The Regional Council for International Education was organized 6 years ago as a tri-state association of colleges and universities seeking help through cooperative efforts in solving some of the problems facing educational institutions in today's shrinking world.

The Regional Council for International Education is a response of 35 colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio to the challenges faced by American higher education in this changing postwar world. The distance to be traveled is very great indeed. The professional training of many present faculty members predates 1945. The stamp of Western culture is still the clearest imprint on much of the content of courses. Foreign students on our campuses and American students abroad are not yet integral parts of our educational process.

Each college and university not only must meet these problems but must choose wisely from among a wide selection of solutions. Each individual school must determine how best to use its resources and how to improve those resources if they are inadequate. The regional council reflects the expanding interest of higher education throughout the United States in interinstitutional cooperation as a means of solving these problems.

Other notable illustrations of such cooperative efforts include the Great Lakes Colleges Association embracing 12 colleges, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of 11 midwestern universities, the 5 Associated Mid-Florida Colleges, and the Associated Colleges of the Mid-West, which includes 10 institutions. There are others, each with its particular focus and its own historical antecedents which determine the form of its organization and the nature of its activities.

It is entirely logical that the development of interinstitutional cooperation should move in this individualistic way. It has brought us a variety of experiences on which to build. Now, however, we should examine more closely the organizational, administrative, and programmatic questions for which there was little time while the first immediate needs were being met but which may have a great impact on future development.

Under the pressures of our postwar society and nudged along by exhortations from such studies as "The University and World Affairs"[1] and "The College and World Affairs,"[2] the institutions have directed a substantial proportion of this cooperative effort toward strengthening the international dimension of higher education. This cooperation serves several purposes. It makes possible what could not be achieved by individual action alone. It encourages careful consideration of policies and principles in international education and helps to gain wide adherence to high standards in that field. It permits the participating institutions to select from a variety of potential activities those best suited to their needs.

---

[1] Report of the Committee on the University and World Affairs; also widely known as the Morrill committee report (J. L. Morrill was chairman of the committee). New York: The Ford Foundation, 1960, 84 pages.

[2] Report of the Committee on the College and World Affairs. New York: Education and World Affairs, Inc., 1964, 74 pages.

Indeed, it is probable that this latter function has become the most important service of institutional cooperation. By and large, American higher education has recognized the *need* to enlarge its competence in international-intercultural dimensions of education; the pressing problem now is *how* to do it with limited individual resources. Institutions sometimes plunge into activities they are not yet well prepared to undertake. Often these are the obvious and more dramatic projects which seem to keep the institution in the mainstream of current educational activity but can actually demean its academic values and diminish its stature among its peers.

It is a purpose of the regional council to help its members avoid such pitfalls and instead to build on solid long-term plans. The council's organization, activities, financial structure, and view of the future are designed within this reference. The council model may not be universally applicable but it may be a useful pattern as other colleges and universities move forward in cooperative efforts.

The activities and programs of the council concentrate primarily on faculty enrichment, assistance to foreign students, and the enlargement of the American student's international horizon. These activities have been developed and funds secured because the council could offer cooperative planning with central coordination and administration.

FACULTY ENRICHMENT

The Faculty Institute for International Studies provides a program of graduated study opportunities for members of the faculties of the member schools. At the first level faculty members attend a 9-month seminar. Participants are selected by a committee of the council from among the nominees of the member institutions. The council requests that the faculty members be given released time from campus responsibilities.

At the conclusion of the 9-month seminar, those participants seeking more advanced study may become candidates for the council's summer seminar or for grants to participate in a seminar of the New York State Department of Education, with which the council has working relations. They may also apply for the annual faculty seminars abroad. Wherever possible, assistance is also given for individual study. Thus faculty members know that there is an opportunity for progressive advancement as their interest and training grow.

The council conducts each year a *Faculty Seminar Abroad* for 12 faculty members from its member schools. Here the American participants meet with colleagues from abroad in intensive programed sessions of at least 7 days. The opportunities for probing ideas and generating lasting personal relationships are obvious.

These seminars have met in Denmark, England, and twice in the Netherlands. The next will be in Yugoslavia in 1966.

STUDENTS FROM ABROAD

The council has established an *Orientation Center for International Students.* Although intended primarily for students entering member colleges, it is also open to others as priorities permit. Instruction in English, cultural orientation, and an introduction to academic practices in the United States are offered.

A Workshop on Intercultural Communications has been introduced into the orientation center program, opening opportunity for citizens to participate in direct association with students from abroad. Preregistration homestays are arranged for the foreign students in cooperation with the Pittsburgh Council for International Visitors. A dual result is obtained. The foreign students have early contacts with nonacademic Americans, who in turn are able to develop their talents and skills in working with visitors from abroad. Many of these Americans serve as volunteers throughout the year.

EUROPEAN-AMERICAN CENTER

Opportunities for faculty and students seeking wider international horizons must include experience abroad. The type and range will differ with individuals and institutions. In order to provide as much flexibility as possible, the council has established a European-American study center in Basel, Switzerland. Here office space is available where traveling council faculty members may study. A varied program includes specialized seminars, language instruction, and predeparture orientation for foreign students. A specialized library is also planned. On the basis of experience with this center, additional centers may be established in other world regions.

The core of the European-American center activities is to be the *Study Year Abroad*, being inaugurated this fall. This program offers a course of instruction in the social sciences and humanities focused upon the problems and opportunities which man faces in dealing with his traditional, political, and cultural barriers. Europe will be used as a laboratory. Because the courses will correlate readily with the curriculums of the member institutions, the student will remain within the mainstream of his educational program while studying abroad. There is no problem with credits since the program is indeed a projection of each participant's own college in Switzerland.

The course of study is open to any student who meets the scholastic and personal requirements, although priority goes to students enrolled in the council's colleges. Thirty-five students from member colleges have been selected from 60 applicants for the coming academic year, 1965–66.

The faculty includes both Americans and Europeans, with the dean selected from among the member colleges. The educational procedure will be American. The language of instruction will be English. Instruction in German and French will be available. Classes are to be held in the center building, and the students will live with Swiss families.

By drawing upon faculty from several European universities, the most useful elements of American and European practice, ideas, and instruction are combined. Close cooperation with the local citizens committee of the European center and the home stay arrangements provide exceptional bridges between the community and the students.

The British-American Lecturer Exchange, made possible by a grant from the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, provides an annual opportunity for one or two council faculty members to spend 6 weeks lecturing in England on subjects within their disciplines, and it also brings to the member colleges specialists from Great Britain for equal lengths of time.

PLANNING

The council has evolved a definite mechanism for program development and supervision. Each of 12 centrally appointed committees has a specific area of responsibility. Each originates and recommends activities which will contribute to the objectives of the council. These proposals are placed before the annual conferences and finally before the board of directors. Throughout this process the central office may also initiate proposals and contribute suggestions. It offers staff services and provides administrative supervision over the execution of the programs after they have been approved.

Ideas can come from all quarters of council membership. Programs are carefully considered and must enjoy broad support throughout the council membership before they are launched. The procedure assures coordination of activities, avoiding the losses which result from overlapping or conflicting projects or those so isolated they cannot hope to mature. Basic policies and goals can be developed, and there is protection against hasty or ill-conceived projects.

ORGANIZATION

The council was organized in a thoughtfully devised pattern intended to help each member institution weave into the fabric of its educational programs an international dimension appropriate to its needs and resources. Two basic and pioneering organizational decisions were taken early: the council would be an association of many schools, and they would be diverse in size and resources. Institutional membership is therefore open to all accredited 4-year liberal arts colleges or universities in the tristate area.

The council has, of course, specific requirements of commitment and participation on the part of its members. Colleges join because they are eager to cooperate—not because of the immediate benefits they might receive. They are quite aware that by sharing in this common effort they are helping to push forward a frontier in higher education.

Since October 1963, the council has been incorporated, with a 23-member board of directors, of which 18 are named by the member institutions sitting in annual conference and 5 are named by the board itself. Board members are selected and serve as individuals rather than as representatives of their home campuses. A president, treasurer, and secretary are board appointees and responsible to it. The pattern and nomenclature of the organization follows that of the traditional university and college, which helps to preserve the concept that the council is in its way an academic center and not merely an administrative structure.

Each member institution names a liaison officer to represent it in relationships with the council. At least 150 faculty members and administrators are engaged each year in active program planning through their membership on working committees. It follows that the vitality of the council does not depend solely on individuals or on institutions but on a combination of both.

FINANCES

Activities of the council are financed by membership dues, foundation grants, contract funds, and contributions. Dues are fixed on a sliding scale related to student enrollment. In addition, each member institution supports a substantial part of the program by paying some of the direct expenses of the activities in which it participates and by its contribution of services and facilities.

Since 1962 the council has received two substantial grants from the Ford Foundation. It has also received financial assistance from the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, the Western Electric Corp., and others. It has developed and administered programs with the Agency for International Development, the Institute of International Education, the African-American Institute, and the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

What of the future? Increasing cooperation among institutions of higher education is clearly a necessity. What is not sure is the form it will take or the patterns it will develop. But it is inevitable that, as experience with cooperative methods grows, those methods will be applied not only in international education but also in the whole broad area of liberal learning. In fact, it may be through an effective balance between the freedom of each college to explore and experiment and the strength which comes from organization for cooperation that liberal learning will make its future gains. The council is moving in this direction.

The council assigns an important role to unified planning, central development, administration of specified services for member institutions, and corporate fiscal responsibility. Thus the member institutions gain the advantages of a central organization constantly sensitive to needs and opportunities. At the same time, each institution remains a free agent within this framework even as individual members of administration or faculty become deeply involved in council activity. Thus, for the moment at least, the council seems to offer the best of two worlds. (*Exchange*, Fall 1965.)

Among Indiana Colleges

*by John M. Thompson**

Mr. Thompson, now in charge of the international studies division of the International Affairs Center at Indiana University, was associated with Robert F. Byrnes in the formulation and early years of the Indiana project.

The Indiana project is a statewide cooperative endeavor among the colleges of Indiana to encourage study by their undergraduates of the non-Western World as a whole or of a non-Western area or areas. For the purposes of the program "the non-Western World" is defined as those areas which have largely been neglected in the traditional curriculum of American undergraduate education; that is, all the world lying outside the United States and Western Europe, and particularly Africa, Asia, and Russia. To avoid the negative and limiting connotations of the term "non-Western," the program was given the resounding title of "The Project for Extending the Study of Foreign Areas in Indiana Undergraduate Education." It still is familiarly known, however, as the "Non-Western Project," and sometimes facetiously, as the "Un-American Project." The focus of this program, therefore, is somewhat broader than Asian studies, although Asian studies form an important and integral part of the work. Also it attempts to affect as many colleges in the State as possible rather than just one institution.

This effort to broaden undergraduate education throughout the State grew out of a conference on the role of non-Western studies in Indiana colleges and universities which was held at Indiana University in September 1958, with assistance from the American Council of Learned Societies. This conference, in turn, was based on a pilot study of the situation in Indiana conducted during the spring of 1958 under the supervision of Prof. Robert F. Byrnes.[1] Not unexpectedly, that study revealed that the average undergraduate in Indiana learned almost nothing of the cultures and civilizations outside the Western tradition. The subsequent conference decided that it was essential for students to become acquainted with the histories, aspirations, and contemporary problems of the non-Western world.

The result was the experimental program now underway in the State, which was initiated in September 1959 with the help of a 3-year grant from the Ford Foundation. The project is administered at Indiana University by the author, a member of the department of history, on a half-time basis. He is assisted by a committee of nine faculty members and deans representing various schools and departments of the univerity. The effort, however, is a cooperative one in-

---

*© 1961 Association of American Colleges.

[1] Robert F. Byrnes, editor, *The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana* (Bloomington: Indiana University publications, Slavic and East Europe Series vol. XV, 1959).

volving as many of the colleges and universities in Indiana as possible. Its activities, largely conducted on the various campuses of the State, are planned and guided by a State advisory committee of 14 members, representing almost half the 30-odd institutions of higher education in the State as well as the State department of public instruction.

The basic philosophy of the project rests on the premise that the main purpose of undergraduate education is not to provide professional, technical, vocational, or even utilitarian training: it is rather to prepare able young Americans to understand themselves, their traditions, and the world in which they must live and act. The study of Western civilization will continue to be the central concern of such liberal education. It is clear, however, that appreciation of our Western heritage alone is not enough. Study of the cultures and societies of the rest of the world will contribute much to an understanding of the universality of experience and knowledge. At the same time, the colleges have an urgent responsibility to equip students to participate in a world very different from that which existed when present curricula and educational policies were established, Problems and decisions that must be faced in the next half century require an appreciation and understanding of the histories and aspirations of the societies of Africa and Asia.

Guided by this general point of view, the Indiana program has two basic purposes. The first is to arouse interest in the problem and to stimulate, encourage, and guide local campus action. Many of the Indiana colleges feel perplexed by this new and vital challenge to American liberal education. They do not know where to turn or how to proceed in assessing its dimensions and in developing appropriate responses. Thus the project stands ready at all times to provide counsel and assistance. A second purpose of the program is to share and increase the resources in the State for undergraduate study of the non-Western areas.

The project has now been in operation long enough to permit a preliminary assessment. In its first activities it has been quite successful in fulfilling its basic purposes. Of the 34 institutions of higher education in Indiana, 13, or 40 percent, have been involved in several activities of the project. Another 7 institutions, or 20 percent of the total, have participated in at least 1 activity of the project. Almost two-thirds of Indiana's colleges have thus been affected in one way or another during the first 18 months of the project. In addition, half of Indiana University's 10 extension centers around the State have taken part in some aspect of the project's work. Thirteen colleges, or the remaining 40 percent, have been relatively untouched by the project, but almost all of this group will be involved in a project activity before the end of the 1961–62 academic year.

Statistics such as this are not, of course, entirely reliable indicators. Much has been done to stimulate and help certain colleges, but in these instances the commitment to the task and the initiative for action have generally come from the colleges themselves, usually under the inspiration of one or two farsighted administrators or faculty members. In other cases the impact of the project has been superficial or nonexistent. Inertia on the part of the leadership of many colleges remains a major obstacle to be overcome. In short, present evidence indicates that the project itself—and, in the long run, the liberalizing of American undergraduate education that is desired—must largely depend on the awareness and vigor of individual leaders within each college community.

At the same time, it is clear that a cooperative effort like the project has an important role to play. Its mere existence is a constant reminder to the colleges of the urgency of this issue for American education. It provides a common point of contact and communication for those who are interested in this question. The project can inform and gently prod, hoping to create the interest and will to act necessary for progress in each college. It can seek out, encourage, and assist individuals who may eventually spearhead the revolution on their own campuses. And once the college itself—in the face of competing claims—has decided that it is important to include study of the non-Western World in its program, the project can be immensely useful in assisting the implementation of that decision.

Faculty fellowships constitute the most important activity of the project. Colleges cannot introduce their students to the non-Western World without teachers who are knowledgeable concerning these areas. Hopefuly, in the decade ahead more and more colleges will be adding teachers with a double competence—good preparation on a non-Western area and first-rate training in a discipline, provided that the graduate schools make an effort to turn out this sort of balanced student. In the interim, however, the desired broadening of the curriculum can most rapidly be achieved by extending the interests and competence of present faculty members.

The project therefore provides fellowship opportunities to assist those now teaching in Indiana colleges to study a non-Western area or language they are interested in but have not previously studied. Under a project fellowship the faculty member spends a semester, an academic year or even 15 months pursuing a flexible program of multidisciplinary study on a non-Western area. In most cases he studies at Indiana University, but if he is interested in an area for which Indiana does not have adequate resources, he attends another university for his training. Unfortunately funds do not permit inclusion of foreign study and travel. The costs of the fellowship, figured roughly on a matching salary basis, are shared by the project and the teacher's institution.

The first faculty fellow to be appointed under this arrangement was Prof. Wendell Calkins, chairman of the department of history at Wabash College. During 1960–61 Professor Calkins studied Far Eastern civilization and Chinese language as preparation for introducing a course in Far Eastern history at Wabash in 1961–62. A second faculty fellow has been appointed for 1961–62, and two will probably be named for 1962–63. Thus, four faculty members of Indiana colleges are expected to receive training on a non-Western area during the life of the project. Although the total number is small, each fellow should have a major impact on the curriculum and intellectual climate of his college.

The chief difficulty in the fellowship program has been that of arranging the release for a full academic year of the most interested and able candidates. Most college faculties in the State are small, and in several instances presidents and deans have indicated that they simply could not spare a leading member of the faculty for this period of time. The project has therefore developed a subsidiary, but still important, program of summer faculty fellowships. Most faculty members in Indiana are free in the summer and welcome an opportunity to enlarge their interests and skills. Although summer study is obviously less desirable than longer periods, the project has encouraged use of the summer months for additional training in an area or language. For summer faculty fellowships the project makes a flat award, and the fellow's institution is not expected to share the expenses (unless substantial expenses such as overseas study are involved). Six summer faculty fellowships were awarded in 1960 and three in 1961.

A corollary to faculty fellowships is a program of faculty seminars. The latter are another way, though less direct and intensive, to extend and increase existing faculty resources in regard to the non-Western areas. The project does not seek to promote or establish faculty seminars but warmly encourages and assists those started on the initiative of local faculty members. Whether or not new courses result, the participating faculty member and the existing courses he teaches are both likely to be enlivened and enriched.

During 1960–61 the project made small grants to two colleges to help defray the costs of materials and of honoraria and expenses for specialist consultants used in faculty seminars set up on local initiative. At DePauw University faculty members from four departments—history, anthropology, geography and political science—formed the core of a faculty seminar on Africa, designed both to work out the syllabus for a new introductory multidisciplinary course on Africa and to improve the knowledge of Africa of the participants who, as a group, would be responsible for teaching the course. Marian College, under the leadership of its history chairman, established a faculty seminar of a dozen members to study the Middle East. Drawing in the first semester on a specialist from Indiana University and in the second on specialists throughout the country, the Marian seminar made excellent progress.

During 1960–61 and 1961–62 the project is participating in a unique experiment with the American Universities Field Staff, an organization making available the services and reports outstanding specialist on various non-Western areas. Under a joint membership sponsored by the project among Indiana colleges, AUFS staff members and reports are used in three ways. First and most importantly, participating colleges each receive during the year one visit of 3 to 4 days from the AUFS specialist on a foreign area, plus five copies of all AUFS reports. For this participation they pay $750. Participating colleges are DePauw, Earlham, Marian, Manchester, Purdue, Valparaiso and Wabash. On each campus the AUFS visitor usually addresses a college or public assembly, participates in classes and seminars and meets informally with faculty and student groups.

Second, AUFS visitors are used as the chief speakers and resource persons in the program of regional institutes and visiting seminars described below. Colleges cooperating in the institutes and seminars pay fees of $50 to $150, depending on the number involved, and each college receives one copy of the AUFS reports. Finally the extension centers of Indiana University throughout the State make use of the AUFS specialists for lectures and consultation on a flexible basis, and Indiana University contributes a portion of the costs of the joint membership. The balance of the membership fee is underwritten by the project.

This experimental joint membership in AUFS is an expensive but extraordinarily valuable program. In 1960–61 the reactions from the colleges were most enthusiastic. The AUFS staff members have reportedly done much to arouse interest and enthusiasm for the study of the rest of the world. For the AUFS specialists, accustomed to visiting larger institutions with a proven and long-established interest in foreign areas and international affairs, the Indiana visits have provided a real challenge, to which they have risen with great skill and zeal.

Many colleges in Indiana have no resources at all for the study of non-Western areas. The project has therefore undertaken several activities designed to share among the colleges what skills and materials are available in the State. One of the most significant of these activities is the program of regional institutes and visiting seminars. The regional institutes are conferences on foreign areas held in urban centers in various parts of the State and designed to draw students and faculty from a number of colleges in the vicinity, as well as interested high school teachers, journalists, and community leaders.

The institutes are generally led by an AUFS staff member, with the assistance of area specialists on the faculties of institutions throughout the State, but local faculty are invited to participate on panels, whenever appropriate, and plentiful discussion from the floor is encouraged. The first such regional institute was held in Fort Wayne on September 26–27, 1960, on southeast Asia. Eight colleges in the area jointly sponsored the meetings, and about 45 students and faculty members participated, as well as teachers and interested citizens in Fort Wayne. A second regional institute was held in South Bend on November 29–30, 1960. The topic was Latin America, with three institutions participating. Cuba was much in the news at that time, and over 200 faculty members and students attended one session or another of the conference.

In view of the success of the regional institutes, four are tentatively scheduled for 1961–62. There are, however, a number of institutions in the State without near collegiate neighbors. In these cases visiting seminars of 2 to 3 days' duration are planned. Two or three area specialists will visit an individual campus to lead a program on a particular area, arranged with the cooperation of local faculty members and student groups. The program will include assemblies, class visits, and meetings with faculty members and with student organizations. No visiting seminars have yet been held, but two are tentatively planned for 1961–62, at Evansville College and at Hanover College.

Another important device for sharing resources in non-Western studies throughout Indiana is the use of television. Courses on foreign areas which few colleges in the State are now able to offer because of a lack of faculty resources can be made available through the television medium. An experimental semester course of this nature in Soviet history was prepared by Prof. Robert F. Byrnes of Indiana University in 1959, under an earlier Ford Foundation grant, and was televised in 1959 and again in 1960. Seven institutions used the course for credit. Students watched two 30-minute televised lectures a week and met once a week on their own account for a discussion session under the supervision of a local faculty member. In addition the course was available by correspondence through Indiana University, and thousands of citizens followed the telecasts with interest without taking the course for credit.

The project is anxious to sponsor additional television courses. There are several difficulties, however, of which the most serious are financial and technical. One solution may be joint sponsorship by the project and the Midwest project for airborne television instruction of an introductory course on Africa, to be taped and then telecast from the MPATI airplane flying over Indiana. Another possibility is sponsorship by the project during 1961–62 of shorter series of four to six 30-minute telecasts on special topics in non-Western studies such as Buddhism or African politics. A series of this kind might fit into such established courses as world history and international relations and provide a useful supplemental resource for the colleges.

The project has also attempted to arouse interest and to increase and share resources in the State by sponsoring a series of traveling exhibits on the non-Western world. There exhibits have already been circulated. One on Indonesian folk art, loaned to the project by the Asia Society, was shown at each of eight institutions for 2-week periods in the spring and early summer of 1960. Another, on the Mekong River, also made available by the Asia Society, was exhibited at 14 colleges in 1960–61. A photographic exhibit, "Sites and Monuments of Thailand," prepared by Prof. Theodore Bowie of the Fine Arts Department at Indiana University, began to make the rounds in March 1961 and will continue to circulate in 1961–62.

The project has encouraged consultation between the colleges and area specialists on both general and specific problems of non-Western studies. In several cases the project has provided funds for consultants' fees and expenses, and in others has given information to the colleges about qualified consultants from outside the State. The director of the project also has been available for discussion of any problems connected with introducing non-Western studies into the curriculum. He met, for example, with the faculty study committee charged with planning a new curriculum at Hanover College and actively concerned with the role of such studies in undergraduate education. The new curriculum proposed by the committee and subsequently adopted by the faculty requires that every undergraduate study, in his junior year, east Asian civilization and some non-Western literature. In preparation for developing this new dimension to the academic program, the former dean of the college, E. Mowbray Tate, will spend the 1961–62 academic year at Harvard, under the faculty fellowship program of the project, studying east Asia and Harvard's basic undergraduate courses on this area.

In addition to the activities already described, the project performs a variety of other services. In 1960, for instance, it prepared and circulated a roster of foreign area specialists in the State. It has attempted to act as an informal speaker's bureau and as a clearinghouse of information of all kinds—on outside fellowship opportunities, on the availability of films and audiovisual materials, on types of travel programs, and so on. A newsletter summarizing such information from a variety of sources is planned for the fall of 1961. The project has also urged the development by each college of basic library resources on the non-Western World, particularly through the use of a graded, annotated bibliography for college libraries recently compiled by the American Universities Field Staff.[2]

As has been suggested several times in the preceding pages, the Indiana project is in some ways an interim and "holding" operation. The longrun solution to the problem of strengthening non-Western studies lies in the reorientation by each college of its own curriculum and in the addition to smaller college faculties of teachers trained to deal competently with different areas of the non-Western World. This latter circumstance means that area specialists trained by the universities should be prepared, psychologically and professionally, to teach in the liberal arts colleges, being willing both to forgo excessive specialization in their area and to participate fully, willingly, and effectively in the basic disciplinary work that will continue to comprise the bulk of college departmental offerings. In addition the universities should consider requiring graduate students in the revelant disciplines who are not area specialists to take a minor in a non-Western field or area; such individuals would then be prepared to acquaint undergraduates with at least one other part of the world.

At the same time the success of the Indiana project up to the present suggests that in the short run there are useful means by which sources of strength in non-Western studies throughout the country can be extended in regions, States, or other natural groupings. While the Indiana program is blessed with a tradition of cooperation and good relations among all the institutions of higher education in the State, both public and private, there is no reason why other groups of institutions, under the leadership of a State or private university with considerable resources in non-Western studies, cannot also achieve substantial results. The geographic unit need not necessarily be a State: it might be a natural educational region, cutting across State boundaries, a part of the State or even a large urban area. A prerequisite is a commitment—which at Indiana University undergirds the whole effort of the project—on the part of administrators and area specialists in the university that this is an important task requiring the investment of substantial time and resources. Fortunately there is evidence both of a growing awareness in other universities of the significance of non-Western studies in American undergraduate education and of the interest of many colleges in cooperative endeavor to meet this challenge. (*Asian Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges*, Ward Morehouse, editor.)

---

[2] Philips Talbot, editor, *A Select Bibliography: Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America* (New York: American Universities Field Staff, 1960).

The Consortium Approach

by Royden Dangerfield

In a paper prepared for a 1966 conference on "U.S. Involvement in Latin American Institutional Development"—one of the events marking Cornell University's Latin American Year—Mr. Dangerfield surveyed the growth of cooperative efforts by U.S. universities and colleges in carrying out oversea projects. Mr. Dangerfield is executive director of the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc., formed by the universities of Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Michigan State.

Since 1951 U.S. universities and colleges have undertaken contracts with the Agency for International Development and its predecessor agencies, under which they render technical assistance in less developed countries. By and large, AID contracts have meant the involvement of U.S. universities in assisting in institutional development. As of December 31, 1965, 71 U.S. universities held 134 contracts involving overseas operations. In these cases institution building is involved.

In addition to programs carried out under AID contracts, the U.S. universities have been engaged in similar overseas operations financed by foundation grants.

The involvement of the U.S. academic community in oversea institution building has been increasing year by year. A few universities are carrying out a relatively large number of oversea operations.

From the beginning, oversea projects have caused problems for the U.S. university. One of the most difficult problems to solve is the recruiting of qualified staff in adequate numbers to man the oversea projects. All too frequently a contracting university is obliged to recruit its oversea staff from other institutions. When this occurs there is very little feedback to the home campus from those serving overseas. There are many reasons for the difficulties encountered in recruiting for overseas service. The tour of duty is usually 2 years, which is enough to discourage many faculty members from accepting an overseas assignment. There are personal problems which deter faculty members from going overseas: an aged parent who can neither be left alone at home nor taken abroad; small school-age children for whom adequate schools are not readily available. More important is the widely held view that the tour abroad constitutes an interruption in career development which spells disaster for the faculty member who participates in oversea projects.

The staffing problem has deterred many smaller institutions from accepting contracts or grants for oversea programs. They feel they cannot spare the staff because of lack of depth.

In the same period when the number of oversea projects has been increasing, the student population on the home campus has grown rapidly. The pressure of student population makes more difficult the release of staff for oversea service.

In view of the difficulties of recruitment, the natural development has been the growth of efforts at securing cooperation among U.S. universities and colleges in the carrying out of oversea projects. At times two institutions have joined together in a bilateral arrangement to carry on an oversea project. At other times regional organizations have been formed, or organizations formed for other purposes have been used, for oversea operations. A number of consortia have been organized in which the manpower resources of a number of institutions are pooled for the purpose of providing staff in adequate numbers to man oversea projects.

It must be pointed out that interinstitutional cooperation is not new and did not begin with efforts to staff oversea projects. Even the current pattern of organizing consortia did not start with the overseas operation. The organization of the Midwest University Library was the result of an effort to solve the problem of how to store bulky, little used, library materials and still keep them available for scholars. It had the further benefit of making materials once held by one university available for use by others. The chartering of the Midwest University Research Association (MURA) was the result of the need to pool resources in order to make available adequate staff to carry on an extensive research effort.

The growth of university activities in the field of oversea operations quite naturally led to cooperative efforts. There is no uniformity in the organizations developed to undertake such operations. Some consist of little more than an agreement between institutions to cooperate in the carrying out of a project. At the other end of the scale, several universities may form a corporation, quite separate from the organizers, which independently administers projects. Between the two extremes are several variants.

It might be well at this point to call the roll of some of the consortia now engaged in overseas operations:

1. *Educational Services, Inc.*, which administers projects on behalf of nine engineering colleges and which holds four AID contracts:
   (*a*) To assist in the development of the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur;
   (*b*) To assist in the development of the faculty of engineering, Kabul University, Afghanistan;
   (*c*) To render worldwide technical services for AID; and
   (*d*) To carry on worldwide research projects.

2. *Missouri Valley consortium:* The Missouri Valley institutions joined in organizing a consortium to render assistance to institutions in underdeveloped areas under an AID contract.

3. *The Consortium for the Study of Nigerian Rural Development* (CSNRD): U.S. universities holding AID rural development contracts in Nigeria (Colorado State University, Kansas State University, Michigan State University, and the University of Wisconsin) joined with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Department of the Interior, and the Research Triangle Institute to accept an AID research contract. Under the contract the consortium is to make an objective assessment of the contribution which AID support is making to rural development work in Nigeria, to identify priority

activities and suggest adjustments of AID programs, and to examine and evaluate the Nigerian governmental program for agricultural development.

4. *The Committee on Interinstitutional Cooperation* (composed of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago) has undertaken a study of AID-financed university programs in underdeveloped countries in order to determine the factors influencing the effectiveness of the university-contract project device for conveying technical assistance. The project also calls for determination of the effect on U.S. institutions of participating in international rural development assistance projects.

5. *The State University of New York* has contracted with AID. Under the terms of the contract the campuses of SUNY are joined together, in cooperation with the agencies of the Brazilian Government, in conducting a project which embodies a study and preparation of a plan for the development of primary education in Brazil.

6. *The California State College system.* The several State colleges of California have cooperatively undertaken a contract with AID under which they, in cooperation with the agencies of the Brazilian Government, will conduct a study and prepare a plan for the development of secondary education in Brazil.

7. *The Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities* (composed of the University of Wisconsin, Michigan State University, Indiana University, and the University of Illinois) has undertaken four oversea projects:

(*a*) Under a Ford Foundation grant, the consortium is assisting in the strengthening of the faculty of sciences of the Universidad Agraria, La Molina, Peru, with regard to both teaching and research.

(*b*) Under a Ford grant, the consortium will assist in the establishment of the National Institute of Development Administration, Bangkok, Thailand. NIDA is to provide graduate-level instruction and carry on research in the areas of economic development, applied statistics, and various areas of business and public administration.

(*c*) The consortium is undertaking an AID contract (still under negotiation) under which it will participate with Brazilian governmental agencies in the study and preparation of a plan for the development of higher education in Brazil.

(*d*) The consortium has joined with agencies of the Brazilian Government, the Antunas Foundation, the American International Association, and institutions of higher education in Brazil in the preparation of a plan for the development of the Planalto region in Brazil. This 6-month effort is being financed by the consortium.

This is not intended to be a complete listing, but rather an attempt to illustrate the type of oversea operations being handled by consortia.

The advantage of the consortium approach is that it permits recruitment from a larger manpower pool than is available to one university. But it must be noted that the existence of a larger number of possible oversea staff does not solve the problems which make recruitment difficult. There still remain those personal considerations which discourage staff members from accepting oversea tours. There remains the belief that 2 years spent overseas can be disastrous to a career. The administrator seeking staff for oversea tours often finds that he is one step further removed from those who must be recruited.

For the administrator of a project, the consortium approach means additional difficulties. It is easier to work with one than it is to work with several. With several universities participating, committees become essential. Committee meetings consume time.

It is not unusual for the consortium to undertake the contract and then, by subcontract, ask one of the consortium universities to administer the project. This is natural because it alleviates the necessity of creating the elaborate administrative apparatus necessary to administer an oversea project.

Faced with the problems of the oversea contract operation, we are finding that the AID contract and sometimes the foundation grant is so restrictive as to prevent a university from doing those things which are necessary to make the oversea operation most effective and to secure adequate feedback to the campus from the oversea activity.

The University of Illinois, Indiana University, Michigan State University, and the University of Wisconsin joined together to form the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities. The consortium, organized in 1964, was established for the purpose of providing funds so that the four universities might undertake in the field those activities which would make the oversea operation more effective. The consortium is also attempting to devise programs which would help develop the capabilities of the home campus to train for oversea service and thus profit most from the oversea activities. The programs which the consortium has developed to assist the universities may be described as follows:

A. MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT

To help meet the increasing need for faculty members capable of contributing to the international aspect of university teaching, research, and service, the consortium supports manpower development in the following ways:

1. *Guaranteeing availability of faculty.*—To give the universities the freedom to appoint new faculty in anticipation of need for oversea service and to assure positions to faculty returning from overeas, a reserve fund has been established for the guarantee of salaries. Such guarantees have increased the ability of the member universities to meet immediate oversea faculty commitments without creating problems of subsequent financial adjustment upon the return of faculty members to campus service.

2. *Integrating faculty oversea experience into teaching and research.*—Faculty members returning to consortium universities after significant oversea experience can receive support for preparing reports, completing studies, developing course materials, and lecturing at the four universities on subjects related to the oversea assignment.

3. *Manpower rosters.*—In order to facilitate more effective determination and utilization of faculty interests and capabilities for oversea service, an inventory of these interests and capabilities has been compiled by means of faculty questionnaires. This information has been reduced to a magnetic tape file, which can be rapidly searched to

match faculty interests and abilities to the needs of oversea projects as these projects originate. This file will be systematically updated and modified as need suggests.

B. TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. *Graduate training.*—Advanced predoctoral graduate students are being supported, on a competitive basis, for dissertation research conducted at an oversea project of one of the four member universities. Criteria for receiving support include customary scholarly standards and potential and the degree to which the dissertation research is related to the international programs of the students' home institutions.

Internships are also available to advanced graduate students, including those in professional schools, for in-service training related to the oversea program of the students' institutions.

2. *Faculty orientation.*—It is believed that orientation and training of faculty members going overseas will enable them to render better service, to derive the greatest professional benefit from the experience, and to increase their subsequent contributions to instructional programs on their respective campuses. Study and experimentation are continuing in order to determine how best to carry out this training, and when, in an individual's career, it will provide the greatest benefit.

C. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

1. *Faculty research.*—Support is available for individual faculty members to undertake small research projects which are associated with, and supportive of, overseas projects of one of the four institutions. Such support could permit a faculty member, at the termination of his overseas assignment, to devote full time to personal research at the overseas location. There are also other possible arrangements which would support both the objectives of the overseas project and the research interests of individual faculty members.

2. *Evaluation of overseas operations.*—The consortium may give financial support for evaluation studies of overseas projects. These studies should be designed to measure the effectiveness of the overseas project and to suggest ways in which future projects may be improved.

3. *Exploratory studies.*—The consortium may support exploration of the feasibility and advisability of undertaking proposed major overseas projects. Such exploratory studies may be related either to an overseas project of a member institution or to consortium projects.

4. *Library materials.*—Funds are made available to help finance acquisition abroad of government documents and other materials related to developing nations and of use in instruction and research at the member universities.

5. *Publication.*—The consortium may help to finance publication and dissemination of reports and other documents related to the overseas programs of the four member universities of the consortium.

During the 2 years of its existence, the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities has been able to assist the four universities in recruiting staff for overseas service. The guarantee program has permitted the addition of permanent staff as replace-ments for staff going abroad. Overstaffing, to the extent of adding 23 staff members, has been supported by the consortium.

The graduate student intern program has made it possible for some 20 graduate students to do their dissertation research abroad. In several cases the professor serving overseas has been able to have his own students in the field with him.

It is believed that the consortium programs have been of real significance in adding to campus programs of instruction and research (paper, "Conference on U.S. University Involvement in Latin American Institutional Development," Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., May 1-4, 1966).

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: THE PROSPECT

Education of Americans for International Cooperation

by Felix C. Robb

The president of George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn., in an address to the 1965 White House Conference on International Cooperation:

A brief glance at the climate in the United States for international cooperation reveals that changes in the world and in our society have far outstripped the performance ability of American education at the local and institutional levels to adapt, to change, to innovate. Yet, by all odds the greatest force for international cooperation in this country—and indeed the chief affirmative influence upon American citizens and voters in their attitudes toward other lands and other people—is education.

Because all nations, whether highly developed or underdeveloped, feel that *their future* development is much dependent upon education, it is clear that education becomes the central affirmative force in the world.

The broad base of citizen support for political leaders willing to give top priority to international cooperation derives from the work of American schools, colleges, and universities. Without the strong involvement of our public schools and our million and a half teachers, a favorable prevailing climate for participation in the United Nations would not exist in this country. I further believe that had it not been for the work of respected and courageous *university* leaders, the once strong American isolationist sentiment would be a grave threat to our leadership in the free world.

As Pogo once said: "We have met the enemy—and he is us." We Americans do so much that is fine and good both here and abroad that we tend to think we have no flaws, when in truth our Achilles heel in international relations is our tendency to be basically proud, provincial, and unprepared for cultural shock. We do not really appreciate fully our *own* subcultures, let alone understand the rest of the world and its awesome problems. To a degree we are still insular, as if that were necessary to our mental health.

Too long, we have taught about foreign cultures in an earnest but antiseptic, sterile way, thereby perpetuating a large gulf between our people and this Nation's foreign policy, a policy which is increasingly complex and sophisticated. Teachers are expected to know, to teach, and talk about the world outside our Nation's borders, yet only infinitesimal numbers of them have lived or traveled off this continent. American teachers need more cross-cultural experiences.

We need to have some better means of encouraging an international outlook and awareness on the part of America's teachers for they are the key to America's future and are the central personages in the remaining years of this century.

Recognizing our inevitable involvement in world affairs, the power and the potential influence of teachers and other educational leaders are enormous and absolutely essential to any effort to make the United States a permanent cooperating member of the family of nations. But the *real* capability of education to facilitate and induce international cooperation has scarcely been tapped.

To promote understanding of other countries and cultures; to maximize our own capacity for viewing the world's people and their problems with greater concern; to help make the world safe for *diversity*; and to prepare a large corps of responsible, well trained, and influential international leaders capable of moving the nations of the earth toward international amity and toward a shoring of the benefits of the greatest society we can conceive for a free world—I wish to identify several strategic leverage points and to propose a vastly heavier commitment of our Nation's resources to international education.

These leverage points and this investment should be of two types: (1) the underwriting of expanded programs that have proved themselves in the past and (2) the support of new ventures which can provide additional strength in the struggle against provincialism, international misunderstanding, and international misadventure.

I see seven major action areas, or leverage points, where a substantial investment would pay large dividends. I will also propose for your consideration some machinery with which to get at the needed improvements.

Among our targets are these:

(1) The reorientation of materials of instruction on all levels to the realities of today's world. This is a task so massive it seems overwhelming, but it must be accomplished in this decade.

(2) Vastly increased opportunity for foreign study and for work-study experience in other countries.

(3) A revolution in foreign language study to build proficiency in a second language into an ever-increasing percentage of our population.

(4) Fullest possible exploitation of certain underdeveloped subject areas in schools and colleges such as geography and cultural anthropology. Their relevance to our time can be demonstrated; their usefulness to the Nation deserves thorough testing.

(5) International education as a field of study. There are too few competent specialists in the highly complex business of studying, directing, and teaching international and comparative education.

(6) An awakening of America's adult-out-of-school population to better understanding of other cultures and the issues that underlie war and peace among nations.

(7) More research. We know too little about the content, the methods, and the effects of international education.

Blocking the path to large-scale preparation of Americans for international cooperation are such obvious barriers as insufficient funds; inadequate materials of instruction; outdated leave and tenure provisions for teachers in local school systems that fail to recognize the value of foreign study and service; failure to utilize living laboratories for international education that exist in every community having a subculture derived from a foreign-born population; an evident inarticulation in international matters between the schools and the colleges; weaknesses in planning for international experiences at the regional, State, and local levels; and a seriously deficient utilization of Americans returned from foreign service and of the never-ending stream of international visitors who give and gain less insight than they could if we afforded better institutional and local arrangements for them.

The greatest yield of international goodwill and cooperation in our entire foreign policy program, in my judgment, derives from our investment in people—not in things. There is need for a massive effort within the United States to establish world awareness through expanded interchange of mature students and through the introduction of informative and attractively presented information about the cultures and nations of the earth outside our own borders. Some procedure needs to be established for determining how this can be accomplished in the neighborhood school, in the community school system, on a statewide basis, and in the country as a whole.

The largest payoff and the best single leverage point is a program of longstanding repute; namely, the exchange of teachers and students. Limited though it has been, the success of educational exchange is evident. The exchange of persons program so ably managed by the Institute for International Education should be expanded 100-fold for American schoolteachers and college professors. Success of the I.I.E. further reveals the potentiality of paraeducational agencies when their expertise is harnessed, and similar citations could be made about the Foreign Policy Association, the Asia Foundation, NEA's Teacher Corps, the AACTE oversea visitation programs, and so on and on. The dividends from sending teams of school and college *administrators* for brief, intensive study tours abroad also are enormous and should be greatly multiplied.

We have enjoyed the fruits of the highly productive National Science Foundation. Now the humanities have *their* national foundation. And before the social scientists present *their* worthy case to Congress, I propose the formation of a Foundation for International Studies.

We need to inject new substance and new life into the international content of the American school and college curriculum. Materials of instruction are woefully inadequate and what exists is disproportionately heavy in its orientation to Western Europe.

We need revitalized and more realistic and accurate portrayals of other nations.

What is known about other lands and cultures has been greatly expanded in the past quarter of a century. Yet this information is not widely reflected in either the curriculum of our public schools or in the texture of materials available to teachers and pupils. There is need for drastic revision in the nature of information provided to America's youth about the world in which they live.

This Conference should call for a reorientation of school curriculum materials toward more realistic concepts of country and culture, toward the understanding of individual differences among people and nations, with far greater stress on human similarities and on the oneness of the human race than is evident in our textbooks today. If we are to build a strong base for international understanding, our educative processes must reveal clearly that men have much more *community* of interests than they have things *not* in common.

Of great latent potential in the schools is the largely moribund field of geographic education. It is improbable that even 1 percent of the U.S. adult population could locate correctly the major countries of the several continents. This has no special significance *per se* except as it becomes one index to an abysmal ignorance that the past 100 years of schooling have done little to eradicate. Vastly more important, of course, is learning about the interaction of geopolitical forces in a changing world. But such subtleties are lost on those who slog around in rudimentary geographic ignorance. Geography as a subject to be learned and taught has never fulfilled its promise; has never really been given the promotion and glamour it deserves. Its potential as a base for international understanding is tremendous.

In the teaching of modern languages we grossly neglect Asia, Africa, and South America. No longer can we afford to let Americans grow up thinking that all one needs in order to be a cosmopolite is to learn French or German. The study of languages and cultures of India, China, Russia, Latin America, and the developing African countries should be encouraged with appropriate incentives to schools, to teachers, and to students. Unfortunately, no university, not even the greatest, provides a sufficiently wide span of language offerings and foreign languages in the schools are taught mostly by people who have neither lived nor studied in the countries where the language is indigenous.

To enable colleges and schools to offer the great variety of language and culture studies needed today, I propose that we supplement our traditional commitment to a handful of major languages. To replace the restrictive language lockstep, colleges and schools should be helped to provide study opportunities and cross-cultural experiences in at least from 25 to 50 basic languages and dialects, these to be accomplished by administrative arrangements and links of American universities, colleges, and schools with their counterparts in those countries we deem important to understand, to learn from, and to help.

In residential centers around the world, intensive language study should be available for 6 to 9 months to facilitate mastery and to replace the superficiality that still characterizes most language instruction in the United States. The cost would not be small, but as we begin to shuttle larger numbers of teachers and students back and forth to other countries in a planned program, the unit cost of transportation should drop. Most importantly, we would produce internationally able people to serve industry, government, and education and, with them, build bridges to every nation of the world.

No areas of American education is in greater need of *research* than our efforts in international education.

We need to know what really happens when an American and his foreign counterpart work together or when they exchange places. We need to know more about the variety of educational approaches to economic, social, and political development and about educational planning and assistance programs.

Just as America's entire elementary and secondary school program had long been hampered by a lack of empirical evidence on which to base decisions, even more are we in the dark as to what we are doing in international education. For instance, we have no clue whatsoever as to the international enrollment in our secondary schools. Is it near zero on a significant factor? We don't know. We need more facts and more research to provide answers to questions and solutions to problems, to fill large gaps in our total effort, and to reveal countless lacunae.

We need badly a definitive study of the international dimensions of the American school, its curriculum, its staff, and its children and youth. *At the top of the list* of research endeavors * * * I would urge the assignment of an international team of psychologists, anthropologists, historians, and educators to an exhaustive study of *the child as a unifying force* in society.

Too little is done in *teacher education* to bridge the cultural gap or to take advantage of every American's opportunity to become acquainted with his own Nation's subcultures and his own community's international resources.

Some agency should underwrite a program of planned international experiences *for master teachers* who would later serve as catalysts in "team teaching" situations and as supervisors. These key leaders would need to be especially sensitive to and enthusiastic about education in international matters.

There are few adequate programs of study for foreign student advisers, for professors of international education, for * * * internationally oriented administrators and specialists without whom a large school system, a State department of education, or a university cannot hope to coordinate and manage successfully the international aspects of its activities.

A different kind of internationally minded teacher is needed in America—a teacher keenly aware of the great tides in history, alert to contemporary issues, experienced in at least one culture or subculture than his own; and strong enough in his faith in America to be willing to admit that on occasions we make mistakes and are honestly, earnestly seeking to find the real road to lasting peace while we defend freedom on many fronts.

Most of our million and a half teachers would welcome involvement and participation in world affairs. The world outside their classrooms and their immediate communities needs to come alive for them. Teachers *have* the natural curiosity of the learner; they *have* interest; most of them *have* a sense of deep commitment to this country and prefer to resort to reason in settling international disagreements.

I would like to see every teacher have a meaningful experience other than tourism in another land and another culture. Short of this, which for many people and for a variety of reasons would not be possible, I think that there should be developed in the United States as many notable centers for the study of international affairs by schoolteachers as can be established, encouraged, and then identified for the teaching profession.

Where are the programs of international education that are specifically beamed at the public school teacher? Where can a teacher get a comprehensive view of world affairs in a summer?

To promote to the maximum the education of Americans for international cooperation and to involve cooperatively all relevant agencies, institutions, and key individuals in our society, I propose the initial establishment of 10 prototype, multifaceted, regional academic centers for international education. These centers would concern themselves with virtually every phase of international living and learning. They would promote, arrange, catalyze, and coordinate within their respective regions international activities for children, undergraduates, advanced graduate students, and adults engaged in continuing study.

Such international centers would offer unusual opportunities for coordinating the academic and residential programs of many international students and Americans preparing for overseas service. They would support foreign and American students in a long-term regular academic program. In the centers assistance would be available to orient visiting educators from overseas * * * in American culture and education. Such centers could also prepare more adequately for overseas activities an unending stream of American businessmen and other noneducators, as well as teachers and school administrators.

Carefully selected professors and advanced graduate students serving as interns would work closely with international students in their various areas of special interests. In turn, resident resource specialists would be appointed from among the international students connected with the center. It is envisaged that international students associated with these centers would be able to contribute directly, and on a regularized basis, to a pool of resource personnel available to public schools for supplemental teaching of social studies, history, and geography at the elementary and secondary levels.

The proposed facilities of the centers would focus on three aspects: (1) a materials and artifacts collection and documentation library; (2) lecture and seminar facilities; and (3) arrangements for teaching, research, and writing to foster a continual intellectual exchange at the highest level between different cultural groups committeed to working in international and developmental education. This theme should be related to the production of more effective and adequately trained personnel in education and their greater availability for overseas service.

In the future we may expect to see the development of consortia of educational institutions joining together in regional centers to seek solutions to the problems of overseas education.

The centers would act as focal points in attracting and successfully serving students and educators from overseas. Increasing numbers of foreign visitors, on educational and professional missions, are coming to the United States each year for brief periods of time. They are primarily interested in visiting cultural and educational centers in America for observation and for exchanging ideas and information with their colleagues and others in ths country. To such visitors, a regional international center would offer a unique facility for assuring the widest possible range of university, community, and school contacts.

Academic *centers* for international education would also aim at initiating new programs and developing and strengthening existing programs of study and research.

To educate more Americans better for international cooperation, we must institute fundamental improvements at all levels of education: elementary, secondary, collegiate, graduate, and continuing education of adults. All have a valuable contribution to make. It is clear that when we improve the elementary school program, we affect virtually every American at an early age when lasting attitudes and viewpoints are formed.

The whole process starts with little children. We must be concerned not only with bright, eager children, but with the unfolding minds of the average and the not-so-bright child and the child whose cultural base is largely one of disadvantage. These children are numerous and they perceive the world in a different way from our version and our vision of it—and this limits their perspectives. We need to involve the American school—both public and private—in ways and in depth never before undertaken in world affairs. Every academic discipline has a contribution to make and in turn has much to gain from a major quest for greater international dimension. Through our common concern for international affairs we can make cultural advancements which only come with interdisciplinary approaches to problems of living and learning. (Address, White House Conference on International Cooperation, Washington, D.C., November 30, 1965.)

Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs

by Percy W. Bidwell *

In his book-length study of international education at the undergraduate level in the United States, published in 1962, Mr. Bidwell concluded with the following recommendations, intended to give undergraduate students an education adequate for responsible citizenship:

Making students more aware of foreign affairs involves more than the revision of certain courses or the addition of new ones; it involves, ultimately, changes in the attitudes of teachers and students, and in the climate of campus opinion. The task has even wider scope. It cannot be restricted to reforms at the undergraduate level; it involves American education at all levels. In the elementary grades, teachers will need to make greater efforts to stimulate curiosity about foreign lands and their peoples, and to induce tolerance for strange ways of life. The secondary schools need to do a much better job in preparing their students in American history and government, in world geography and world history. If students entering college had better training in these subjects, college teachers could pitch freshman and sophomore courses at a higher level, giving more emphasis to the interrelation of foreign and domestic affairs. Eventually, it might be advisable to drop the introductory lower division courses in American history and government from college curriculum and to substitute for them, as optional distribution requirements, courses in comparative government, international relations, or non-Western civilization.

Reform of education at the graduate level is needed to improve the teaching of undergraduates in subjects related to foreign affairs. Prospective college teachers of history and the social sciences should be generalists and not mere specialists. They should be taught to view sympathetically the needs of the rank and file of undergraduates, particularly those in the lower division, and to regard instruction in introductory courses not as a bore but as a challenge.

Adult education, also, is involved. The interests and attitudes of freshmen and sophomores reflect those that characterize their homes and their local communities. Students whose parents and acquaintances are not interested in public affairs, and who are badly informed about events outside their immediate neighborhood, are less likely to show interest in foreign affairs than students from a less provincial environment. Here, we are concerned with what can be done to improve *undergraduate education.* Education at other levels lies outside our terms of reference. It is important, however, to recognize that progress at the undergraduate level will always be related to progress at other levels.

---

*© 1962 Columbia University Press.

The wide diversity of American colleges and universities, in size and resources, in academic standards, and in the qualifications of their students, makes it impracticable to frame a set of uniform recommendations for the improvement of undergraduate education in foreign affairs, or in any other field. Instead, the following pages suggest various lines of policy and avenues of approach which may be helpful to administrators and faculty members who want to do a better job in educating the common run of undergraduates in foreign affairs.

SPECIALIZED COURSES

Small enrollments in specialized courses dealing with foreign affairs are largely the result of students' lack of interest in the subject. To remedy this situation, to convert indifference into active concern is a long-range task which we shall consider later. Faculty regulations also restrict enrollments by refusing admission to students who have failed to take one or more prerequisite courses. Such regulations, in every college, should be examined with care, and some skepticism, by the curriculum committee, to see whether courses now restricted to upper division students might not profitably be opened to sophomores, or in some cases to freshmen as well. No instructor should set up new prerequisites except with the permission of the committee.

Inadequate counseling is in part responsible for low enrollments in elective courses dealing with foreign affairs. Freshmen and sophomores know little about the curriculum. They are not acquainted with the content of upper division courses, particularly in subjects not directly related to their special interests. Here is a new opportunity for the counselor. At present, he helps students with personal problems and tries to east their "adjustment" to college life. He interprets, for them, the complex provisions of the college catalog so that they shall not fail to meet all the requirements and acquire all the credits necessary for graduation. He guides them in the choice of courses allied to their vocational interests. However, giving advice on courses from the point of view of their contribution to the students' general education usually is not regarded as one of his responsibilities. By including this service among the counselor's duties, colleges would increase enrollments in underpopulated courses, making more effective use of teaching resources, and at the same time improve the chances that seniors will emerge better informed about the world around them and better prepared for responsible citizenship.

GENERAL EDUCATIONAL COURSES

Whatever knowledge and understanding the bulk of students acquire about foreign affairs, they will probably get in introductory, lower division courses. Deans and heads of departments, therefore, should take a fresh look at the content of these courses to find what changes could be made which would enlarge the students' acquaintance with the the international scene and, at the same time, make instruction in the subject matter itself more effective.

HISTORY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

At present, in most colleges and universities, introductory courses in American history and the social sciences are badly in need of reorganization. American history is isolated from world history; the first course in government deals almost exclusively with the Government of the United States; the descriptive sections of elementary economics consider only the American economy. Introduction to sociology devotes attention almost exclusively to American social conditions and American social problems. Concentration on the American scene in these courses deprives the student of knowledge of the history, the political institutions, and economic and social conditions in foreign countries. Likewise, it is bad pedagogy, for it neglects opportunities to deepen, through comparison and contrast, the students' understanding of American institutions and American policies.

Courses in the history of Western civilization provide for many undergraduates, particularly in schools of business administration and in teachers' colleges, their principal source of information on foreign countries. Courses in this field which superficially treat a vast range of historical events should be revised so as to provide more intensive consideration of selected topics or epochs.

Courses in Western civilization usually fail to deal with the U.S.S.R. and countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In the present overextended condition of these courses, injections of non-Western material seems inadvisable. It seems preferable to deal with non-Western civilizations either separately or in a course on world civilization.

Even better results, the author believes, might be obtained by supplementing the survey course in Western civilization, or world civilization, with one or more courses giving concentrated attention to a non-Western area. Because competent teachers of non-Western civilizations are in short supply, colleges, before setting up new courses, should explore the possibilities of utilizing the teaching resources of neighboring institutions, through cooperative arrangements.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

All colleges should make available to lower division students a course, or courses, dealing in fundamental fashion with problems of American foreign policy, the causes of international conflicts, and the means of avoiding or alleviating them.

ROTC COURSES

In ROTC courses dealing with American history and international relations, in general, instruction is conducted at a lower level than in corresponding courses of academic programs. In courses taught by military officers, a certain amount of indoctrination seems unavoidable. Consequently, these non-military subjects should be taught by civilians, regularly appointed members of college and university faculties who are responsible to academic authorities.

LITERATURE AND LANGUAGES

Teachers should exploit more fully, for the benefit of the common run of undergraduates, the rich contributions which modern literature and languages can make to the knowledge of foreign countries. These courses should serve as a gateway to the understanding of foreign cultures. For effective work of this sort, teachers will require more training than they now receive in cultural anthropology and sociology.

THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

For general education courses, the highest type of instruction should be provided. They should not be staffed, as so often happens at present, principally by graduate assistants and the less experienced junior members of the staff. For freshmen and sophomores, the most valuable end product of an introductory course will not be a collection of facts but the command of a few sound generalizations and a useful method of approach to a social science. This kind of instruction can be supplied only by the best teachers. To economize their services, departments should experiment with recently devised electronic aids, including closed-circuit television.

Unfortunately, at present, successful teaching of introductory courses is not as likely to advance a young instructor or assistant professor as research and publication. Hence, in order to guarantee a continuous supply of good teachers in the lower division, administrative officers may have to revise their criteria for promotion.

EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAMS

Although extracurricular activities were not included in this study's terms of reference, their relation to work in courses deserves attention.

College authorities who are seriously interested in giving the bulk of their undergraduates a sound basis for understanding foreign affairs should devote their time and energy primarily to reforms within the curriculum. Extracurricular activities have a higher advertising value and are easier to set in motion, but the results are less substantial. Too often such activities have "* * * a rather sentimental quality. They tend to further the notion that international relations are chiefly a matter of good will and emotional commitment."

Extracurricular programs may usefully supplement classroom work and independent study, but are no substitute for either. A lecture by a foreign diplomat or a U.S. Foreign Service officer may provide "a quick injection of information and interest" (to quote Professor Byrnes) but will have little lasting value unless coordinated with classroom work.

For the most part, the students who attend the various meetings, visit the exhibits of foreign art, attend the showings of foreign films, and go on field trips to Washington or to the U.N. headquarters in New York are majors in political science, history, or international relations. Although the common run of undergraduates may rarely participate in these activities, they, nevertheless, may serve to make him more aware of, and more interested in, what goes on outside the United States. They may help to create on the campus a climate of opinion favorable to the study of foreign affairs. This is one of the chief functions of the international relations clubs that are active on some 200 campuses.

The effectiveness of extracurricular activities in supplementing classroom instruction and in stirring the undergraduates' interest varies widely from one campus to another. As a rule, it is at a maximum in institutions where, *within the curriculum*, courses dealing with foreign affairs are best organized and where they attract the largest relative enrollments. In such cases where intra- and extracurricular programs reinforce each other, it is not always easy to locate the initial impetus. In fact, both may have had a common origin. Unusually widespread interest in foreign affairs among the undergraduates in some colleges often has been owing to the energetic efforts of a single officer—a dean or a president—whose experience in war or in postwar Government service abroad convinced him of the need of giving all undergraduates more knowledge of foreign countries and their relations with the United States. In certain church-related Protestant colleges and in a number of Roman Catholic institutions, a strong missionary interest among both students and faculty explains the exceptional attention to non-Western countries in the curriculum and in extracurricular activities.

Each year some 3,500 undergraduates receive academic credit in American colleges and universities for study in foreign universities, either in summer courses, in junior-year-abroad programs, or in independent study. Under the best conditions, the foreign experience can make a unique contribution to the participating students' knowledge of foreign countries. It can make them more competent in foreign languages, can deepen their appreciation of the characteristic features of foreign cultures, and stimulate them to vigorously pursue studies in foreign affairs on their return to their home campuses. At some universities, notably at Stanford, careful selection of the students who participate and systematic organization and supervision of their foreign studies have enabled students to realize all these advantages. Elsewhere, the results have proved far less satisfactory. "Too many of the programs for study or work abroad have been shallow in conception and shoddy in execution, leading at best to a gloss of cosmopolitanism to adorn the traveler and at worst to the false belief that he has acquired more than a superficial notion of what the world is all about."

Like extracurricular activities, the study abroad programs (cocurricular, if you like) have minimal importance in the foreign affairs education of the common run of undergraduate. Both the expense of travel and the lack of interest restrict student participation in most institutions to a small fraction of the undergraduate body. The Stanford program enlists each year only 280 out of a total enrollment of 5,000 undergraduates. At Kalamazoo College, where a summer study abroad program has recently received a $1,600,000 endowment, President Hicks expects that ultimately one-half of each year's senior class will have studied abroad. But these figures are exceptional; taking the country as a whole, only one undergraduate in a thousand benefits from foreign study programs.

A COORDINATOR OF STUDIES AND ACTIVITIES

The failure of the colleges to give their undergraduates adequate knowledge of the international scene, and the problems which confront the President in the field of foreign policy, is not so much due to the lack of resources as to the failure to effectively employ available resources.

In every college and university, therefore, the president should assign to a senior professor, or to a senior member of his administrative staff, the duty of coordinating curricular and extracurricular activities relating to foreign affairs, so that they may be more effective in undergraduate education. The person so designated, who might be known as the coordinator of foreign studies, should, of course, have no authority to determine what should be taught, by whom, or how. Nor should he be able to determine the direction of research. He should "coordinate" in the true sense of the word, bringing various activities into harmonious relation with each other. The ways in which he will carry out his assignment in any institution will vary with local circumstances. Here, we can only outline the general nature of his task.

At the outset, he should make an inventory of the college's resources for education in foreign affairs. He should make himself acquainted with the content of courses in various college departments and in schools of the university which contribute, or which might contribute, to the undergraduate's knowledge and understanding of the international scene. From the same point of view, he should study extracurricular activities and include them in his inventory. Every college has on its teaching staff a number of men and women—they may be anthropologists, biologists, or specialists in public health or in municipal administration, or economists, or engineers—who have lived, worked, and traveled abroad. The knowledge they acquired constitutes one of the institution's resources for the study of foreign affairs. In most cases, this fund of information and opinion, because it is dispersed, is not fully exploited. It should be one of the duties of the coordinator to be informed about faculty members' foreign experience so that at appropriate times and places, perhaps in general education courses, or in students' discussion groups, they can make useful contributions.

Every college, except the smallest and the poorest, offers in its various fields of study—in history, in the social sciences, and in the humanities—8, 10, or a dozen specialized courses which aim to provide either knowledge of foreign countries, or of American foreign policy, or both. But, as we have seen, such direct exposure courses attract few undergraduates. Working through student counselors, the coordinator should attempt to make sure that failure to enroll in these courses is not owing to the lack of information about them.

General education courses, the chief traffic points in the undergraduate curriculum, offer students opportunities for instruction in foreign affairs, but they are usually oriented to the American scene. Here the coordinator faces a delicate task. He cannot impose his ideas on his colleagues. He can, however, endeavor to make clear to them that giving a wider orientation to their courses would enhance their educational value.

The nonspecialist undergraduate is not attracted by lectures, forums, exhibits, and international relations clubs or other extracurricular activities designed to stir interest in foreign affairs. He makes few contacts with students from foreign countries. Here is another job for the coordinator. He should attempt to establish closer connections between the curriculum and extracurricular activities, and should be on the lookout for ways by which the foreign students might be brought into contact with a larger number of undergraduates.

Professors of history, political science, and economics take responsibility for the education of students who have a special interest in foreign affairs. But no one takes responsibility for the nonspecialist, to make sure that knowledge of foreign affairs forms a part of his general education. Looking after this forgotten man should be a prime responsibility of the coordinator. In this task, he must look to the student counselors to help him. Without having formal jurisdiction, the coordinator should be in a position to advise these advisers. To make their services to undergraduates more effective, he should furnish them the information which he has assembled on courses dealing directly with foreign affairs.

Programs of international studies which, ideally, should radiate interest in foreign affairs throughout the campus community, are now often insulated from it. To find a remedy for this situation should be one of the tasks of the coordinator. He should endeavor to throw bridges across the gap which, in many colleges and universities, separates specialized education from general education in foreign affairs.

The apathy of the typical undergraduate—his indifference to matters of public policy—presents a formidable obstacle to his education in foreign affairs. To transform apathy into interest and indifference into concern, should be one of the coordinator's principal preoccupations. Students are sensitive to the prevailing climate of campus opinion. They want to do what is being done, to say what is being said, and to believe what is believed. If, in the campus atmosphere, they continually detect indications of interest in foreign affairs they, too, will become interested. The establishment, perhaps in the graduate school, of a new program of international studies, if well publicized, or the appointment to the faculty of a distinguished British or Italian historian, or an eminent foreign scientist or a celebrated poet, will attract undergraduate attention. By adding a bit of drama to the arrival of a group of students from India, Russia, or Africa, or to the departure of fellow students for a year of foreign study and travel, the air of the campus could be impregnated with extra-American elements.

The 50,000 students from abroad now enrolled in American colleges, universities, and technical schools represent a neglected source of knowledge and understanding of foreign countries. The almost universal failure, to date, to effectively utilize this resource has several explanations. About one-half the men and women from abroad are either graduate or special students and are more mature than the average American undergraduate. Foreign students are usually housed off campus; in their studies, they are associated principally with professors and graduate students. The few undergraduates who seek them out are usually specializing in some aspect of foreign affairs. In spite of these and other obstacles, several women's colleges, among them Sarah Lawrence and Wellesley, and a few coeducational institutions, notably the University of Arizona, University of Minnesota, and Ball State Teachers College, have achieved some success in making foreign students acquainted with a fairly large number of undergraduates, to their mutual benefit. The coordinator should study procedures of these institutions to determine whether they might be adapted or improved in his institution.

Stirring undergraduates' interest in foreign countries is not a one-man job. To achieve substantial progress in this direction, the coordinator will need day-by-day assistance, not only from teachers of courses in international relations but also, and more importantly, from teachers of history and geography, government, economics and sociology, languages and literature, religion and philosophy. In their introductory courses, particularly, they should be on the alert to enrich instruction by relevant comparison of American life with foreign institutions, traditions, and philosophies. Thus, many of the coordinator's colleagues will share responsibility with him for making American college students constantly aware of peoples in other parts of the globe whose interests and theirs are interdependent. Dean Watts, of Brown University, has written:

> What really matters is to establish on a given campus, in all courses where it can find expression, an intellectual atmosphere which assumes our deep involvement with countries outside the United States and outside the centers of Western culture. The sensitivity of the faculty to such matters is what counts. (Letter to the author.)

The theme of this book is that knowledge and understanding of the international scene should form an integral part of the education of all college undergraduates. We have argued that young men and women emerging from college need acquaintance with foreign affairs if they are to speak and act intelligently and responsibly as voters and citizens. Furthermore, they need this sort of knowledge to enable them to fully enjoy life as intelligent persons. From the second point of view, the purposes of the study of foreign affairs are identical with those of a liberal education, i.e., education for its own sake—"* * * to know the sheer joy of understanding; to speculate, to analyze, to compare, and to imagine."

These two objectives need not conflict; each can supplement the other. There is no reason why a student who, in order to better discharge his civic responsibilities, has taken courses relating to foreign countries, may not also derive from them keen intellectual enjoyment. Conversely, a student who has studied international affairs to round out his general education, or out of pure intellectual curiosity, will find knowledge thus acquired valuable in forming intelligent judgments on issues of foreign poicy.

This book has focused attention on the common run of undergraduate. It has emphasized his need for knowledge of foreign affairs and has pointed out various ways in which colleges and universities can satisfy that need. By this emphasis, however, we do not intend to depreciate the value of specialized studies at the undergraduate level. The country needs more men and women whose expert knowledge in foreign affairs fits them for teaching and research, and for positions in private industry and government employment. Likewise, it needs legislators and men of affairs whose accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the international scene enables them to speak with wisdom and authority on issues of foreign policy. The need for an elite—well-qualified leaders of opinion on questions of foreign policy—is well recognized. To satisfy this need, colleges and universities, aided by foundation grants, are putting forth vigorous and, on the whole, well-directed efforts. But in their concern for the leaders they have neglected the followers.

Now they need to recognize that leaders are powerless without followers, and that the quality and effectiveness of leadership in foreign policy will in large measure depend on the response of educated public opinion. The followers must not be an ignorant crowd, giving unquestioning assent to policies enunciated by their leaders. They must include a substantial body of well-informed men and women genuinely interested in foreign affairs who will support only the policies which they can defend with a good conscience, and who will bring pressure on the leaders to modify or abandon policies which fail to meet this test. To increase the number of followers of this type, and to strengthen their influence, should be one of the major purposes of general education in foreign affairs. (*Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs.*)

Relating International Developments to the Undergraduate Curriculum

by William W. Marvel

In a speech to a 1966 conference on "Curricular and Instructional Innovations" sponsored by Towson State College, Baltimore, Md., Mr. Marvel—president of Education and World Affairs—discussed the significance for the liberal arts colleges of the developing Federal program for international education.

In the question of gaining a real international perspective, American higher education has a much longer distance to travel than it has so far come.

It is late in the day to be arguing the case for giving American undergraduates—all American undergraduates—some sense of the larger world community that will press in on them as adult citizens more insistently than it ever has on us of the present middle generation. This case has been presented—not once, but repeatedly. Most of the issues have been defined. The challenge is there for all to see who care to look.

I would cite only one of the numerous occasions over the last decade where this case has been forcefully made to the educational leadership of the Nation.

> A first-class liberal education in the 2d half of the 20th century should unquestionably include an effective international component. * * *
>
> The student's education in world affairs is inseparable from the larger purposes of liberal education. As his teachers break away from what is largely a Western, if not American, parochialism, they will give the student a deeper understanding of the United States itself as well as a sense of the great variety of cultures and societies in the world. This process, however, has far to go. We are even further from the goal of giving the American college graduate a meaningful exposure to a society in contrast to his own. Yet these are urgent needs, applicable to students in science, agriculture, or engineering as well as to those in economics, philosophy, or history. The upgrading of faculty competence and the reordering of curricula to give an adequate place to world affairs are tasks that still confront most of our universities and colleges.

The date—1960. The document—the report of the Ford Foundation Committee on the University and World Affairs [chairman: J. L. Morrill, formerly president of the University of Minnesota]. Circulation of the Morrill Committee report: Well over 100,000 copies to date.

But have the colleges and universities picked up the challenge? How far has higher education moved in the directions suggested by the authors of the Morrill Committee report?

The main question, of course, is not the numerical increase in professors abroad, foreign students here, and all the other indexes of activity and motion in international education. The real issue is whether an evergrowing proportion of our annual crop of college graduates, as they march with diplomas in hand away from alma mater, are educated to a more and more thorough understanding of the forces that are shaping their world. Are they becoming infected in college with a throbbing curiosity about some part of the outside world and its meaning for their lives? And are more and more graduating students so infected? Is their college experience serving them in this respect as an individual's education must always serve—as an introduction to learning, not the achievement of learning? Have they been led in paths that encourage them to think critically and constructively about problems in our foreign relations? Or have they to show for their 4 years of higher education nothing better than a little satchel of cliches on De Gaullism, on Castroism, or on Communist China? Have they, to put the question in thoroughly contemporary terms, have they gained any intellectual equipment to help them grapple as responsible citizens with the Vietnam crisis in American foreign policy—a situation that seems to move inexorably along one axis, from discomfort to deep complexity to acute difficulty and finally to paralyzing dilemma.

Unfortunately, most informed observers do not seem to be sanguine about our national performance on this front. Although we have no satisfactory measures of national, or indeed of institutional, progress, I worry that on a relative scale we are falling behind. New colleges and universities are being created and existing ones expanded, the tide of young people seeking—and gaining—admission to higher education—these processes are outpacing the development of international perspectives in the curriculum, in the campus life, and in the minds of students.

There are, to be sure, peaks of exceptional achievement, institutions that leap to mind as exemplars in the building of an international orientation. But the roster of such colleges and universities today would turn up few that would not have been on a similar list 10 or 15 years ago.

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the capacity of the day-to-day problems of institutional growth to absorb the minds and energies of our educational leaders. Campus planning; capital fund campaigns; plant expansion; the demands of science on men and budgets; the latest moves of campus activists who may feel they are getting less than their tuition-dollar's worth, but turn out to protest about something quite different; new programs to help the culturally undernourished find their rightful place in our society—these and many others form the day's agenda of items clamoring for attention by the president when he walks into his office on any given morning. Such are the problems that constitute the educational dynamics of America in the mid-1960's. No one will deny their immediacy and importance.

So it is hardly surprising that the international dimension of the institution's personality is so often neglected. The modern concern with world affairs in undergraduate liberal education is still a comparatively new thing and many other urgencies apparently have to take precedence.

But meanwhile a fast-growing complexity enshrouds the problems among nations and within nations that the educated and responsible American citizen must strive to understand.

Meanwhile, the "market situation" grows ever tighter for faculty qualified to lead our young men and women in cutting through this complexity.

Meanwhile, we have left largely uncorrected one of our great anomalies: the fact that the largest universities with the most powerful resources in international and area studies at the graduate level, are often the very ones that have done least to provide their general *undergraduates* with liberal learning enriched with an international dimension.

And meanwhile, we are just barely waking up to the problem of what we might call "the other two one-halves": first, the more than one-half of our college students who spend all four of their undergraduate years, not in liberal arts but in professional schools—of engineering and agriculture, of business and journalism, and perhaps most significantly in this connection, in teacher-training institutions. The other one-half are those youngsters who never join the 4-year college population, especially the major segment who stop at the end of high school or before. Are they to be left without even the most rudimentary intellectual equipment to understand the ebbs and flows of world affairs that will have such major impact on their country during all their adult lives? So far, across the length and breadth of the land, and with only the tiniest exceptions, this is precisely how we have left them.

I know I have painted a dark picture. I hope it may not be too dark, though I suspect it does not miss the mark by a wide margin. But still, the conclusion we draw is not one of total despair and resignation, for it is not as though we were truly powerless to mobilize the forces that would carry us to new and higher ground *if* we once determined that these efforts should have our high-priority commitment.

It is to this more optimistic and forward-looking facet of our situation that I want to devote the time remaining to me—first to suggest what seem to me some of the implications of the International Education Act of 1966; and then to conclude with a few suggested guidelines in the matter of building an international component in American undergraduate education.

A significant new opportunity to move toward the higher ground I speak of is opened up for the colleges and universities by the President's broad new international education program of 1966. And the provisions of the proposed International Education Act—especially as they pertain to the colleges—probably add up to the most significant breakthrough registered anywhere in President Johnson's program. Although you are no doubt familiar with the general import of this section of the act, section 4, it may be worthwhile for me to take time read paragraph (a) of that section. It begins:

> The Secretary (of HEW) is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist them in *planning*, *developing*, and *carrying out* a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. Grants made under this section may be for projects and activities which are an integral part of such a comprehensive program such as—
>
> (1) faculty planning for the development and expansion of undergraduate programs in international studies;
>
> (2) training of faculty members in foreign countries;
>
> (3) expansion of foreign language courses;
>
> (4) work in the social sciences and humanities which is related to international studies;
>
> (5) planned and supervised student work-study-travel programs; and
>
> (6) programs under which foreign teachers and scholars may visit institutions as visiting faculty or resource persons.

Both in philosophy, and particularly in the future possibilities of financial support, this section of the act lifts the relationship between the colleges and the Federal Government to a new plane. Within the present framework of the National Defense Education Act, an undergraduate institution seeking to launch or strengthen an international program can seek Federal funds really only under the concept of area and language centers, or as a research-connected enterprise. Although area and language studies have some validity at the undergraduate level, this concept is a thoroughly inadequate—and sometimes distorting—means for bringing an international dimension to American undergraduate education.

It presents problems for the institution, for the faculty, and for the students. It requires the type and magnitude of faculty resources which most colleges cannot hope to assemble. It calls for more concentration of teachers, library holdings, and student enrollments on one particular area of the world, or on one special set of countries, than is consonant with the very nature of an undergraduate liberal arts institution. And for the students it tends to provide a single-track system: it can serve reasonably well the needs of the few for whom early specialization is appropriate; but it misses the many who need at least to be touched by the study of world affairs in the course of their 4 baccalaureate years.

Section 4 of the proposed new act is therefore especially significant. It encourages and supports the kinds of approaches that undergraduates teaching institutions can and should undertake. It specifically authorizes funds for the various elements of international studies that colleges should be urged to incorporate into their own programs. Going beyond the rigid NDEA framework of area and language centers into which a college now must somehow fit its needs, the new legislation outlines a general pattern of development. In effect, institutions are given an opportunity to plot their own individual courses within fairly wide limits.

This conceptual breakthrough in Federal support for undergraduate international studies is of course important, but simply writing the new philosophy into legislation would be relatively meaningless. To make a real difference to the colleges of America, it must have significant money to back it up. And here again there is at least the prospect of significant advances. Whereas the funds available under NDEA for undergraduate area and language centers have always been small—indeed they are extremely modest even for the graduate centers of title VI—present planning suggests a rather rapid escalation of the amounts, year by year, under section 4 of the new act. This is a good thing because it will take a good deal of money to realize the promise for American education held forth by the International Education Act. It is my impression that realization of this fundamental truth is at last coming through in Washington, and that there will be an attempt for fiscal year 1968 and for those following, to seek from Congress really significant levels of funding for the programs now being legislated.

Also of importance in the proposed International Education Act—although not nearly matching section 4 in significance—are certain amendments of title VI of NDEA. Title VI pertains mainly to the universities, but there is nevertheless meaning for the colleges in the fact that the tight "not readily available in the United States" requirement for language support would be modified, and the 50–50 matching requirement would be lifted. This, too, contributes to the latitude and flexibility of arrangements if institutions of higher learning are really to be encouraged to assess their own possibilities and develop stronger resources in the international field.

For my last major point I should like to turn to more practical considerations. Against the background of these hopeful developments, within the framework of more flexible program terms, and with the prospect of significantly larger sums of money becoming available, the individual institution, the liberal arts college of America, is still the operative institution. That is where the responsibility will rest for initiation and planning; but no college is excluded or out of the running by virtue of the low baseline from which it may start its development. As there are greater opportunities now for plans and programs to be realized, however, so the competition will be keener, and a heavier burden of responsibility in moving the institution forward will be felt by the administrative and faculty leaders of the college.

Let us look for a moment at the question of the widely contrasting baselines from which different institutions will begin their concerted development in international studies. The colleges of America will show at least as much variation in this respect as do the universities. An enormous gap separates such behemoths of international education as Harvard, Cornell, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan State, Berkeley, from some of the newer municipal universities, or recently converted public universities, or even larger, complex institutions which, for one reason or another, are underdeveloped in the international field.

This same spread across a wide spectrum characterizes the college field. There are a number of undergraduate liberal arts institutions in the United States that are in fact highly advanced in the development of an international dimension. They, too, like the large universities, have achieved considerable faculty and administrative expertise and experience, and with the momentum they have generated, can carry forward with relatively little outside guidance. They know where to look for funds. They have developed standards by which to distinguish useful and educationally productive kinds of programs from those which are simply faddish or evanescent or disruptive of the college's basic mission. They have grown aware of the opportunities—widely dispersed through Government agencies, private foundations, and other organizations—to send their professors abroad for experience and training; to locate planning, reading, and instructional materials; to obtain visiting professors from overseas; and to give their students the chance for study abroad. So we need not worry much about the relatively few institutions that are really airborne, because it is usually a matter of their being launched in fact into "self-sustaining growth."

But the problem of increasing the wisdom of Americans about world affairs is *far from being solved* when not more than 10 percent of its undergraduate institutions have shown notable progress—and the figure is probably closer to 5 percent. We need to be deeply concerned with all the others—with the less developed 90 or 95 percent—because so large a proportion of our future citizens are being educated there. The imperative can be simply stated: the United States, in view of our world responsibilities and the high stakes for mankind that ride on the wisdom of our foreign policy, simply cannot afford to see large numbers of our own young people receive a higher education which is untouched by understanding of the great forces at work in the world.

So what does the institution do that starts from a low baseline? No one can write an exact prescription for any college or university in America. There is too much individuality, too many distinct institutional personalities, for anyone to feel confident about drawing blueprints of the exact structure to be erected. This is an area where there are no "school solutions," but where some general guidelines can be found. It is perhaps possible to derive a set of "best practices" out of the experimentation with new approaches that has gone on in widely scattered places across the Nation. At least it is possible to scrutinize carefully some of the most promising innovations in undergraduate world affairs teaching, and adapt to one's own campus setting a blend of the most relevant ideas drawn from different sources.

On the basis of such an eclectic approach, I would propose a 5-point program or series of successive steps for any low-baseline institution that determines to embark on the course of enriching its curriculum, campus life, and student experience with an international perspective.

First, the college must determine where the actual leadership of the new effort will be placed, making that decision clearly understood throughout the institution. From that time forward, it must develop internal support for those who will lead the new program and assure that sustained attention is given to enhancing the leadership role. This role can be assumed by the president of the institution himself, or assigned to a dean, a senior and influential faculty member, or a small faculty committee functioning in close liaison with the president or dean.

Second, the prime requirement for a successful outcome is careful planning of the institution's new approach and program. This is the central and most important responsibility of those who undertake leadership. Their initial move should probably be to ascertain present resources and strengths, by taking a careful inventory of international training, experience and competence among the faculty and students of the institution. At the same time, they should be evolving a clear statement of the college's own mission and objectives, and thinking through the question of how the development of a solid international dimension would help to achieve the institution's goals. That statement should be one that would gain wide acceptance on campus. Thus should a consensus be built to guarantee that the new undertaking—to which the institution will have to commit much energy, time, and money—begins from a wide base of approval and hopefully, of dedication. It is important to remember that the ringing emphasis of section 4 of the new International Education Act is on the requirement for this kind of systematic, creative planning by the college itself. The development of this plan, by the way, appears as an absolute prerequisite for the awarding of funds by HEW. Presumably the skill, relevance, and imaginativeness of the planning process will have a major bearing on where the particular institution comes out in the competition for Federal grants.

Third, those leading this new development in the college must familiarize themselves thoroughly with the literature on undergraduate, non-Western, and international studies. There are a number of published reports and other materials, but perhaps three stand out as the most relevant items on which to begin. One is the report of the Ford Foundation committee on "The University and World Affairs" which I mentioned earlier. A second is the Nason Committee study, a report prepared under the sponsorship of the Hazen Foundation by a committee chaired by John Nason, now president of Carleton College. Entitled "The College and World Affairs," this report is perhaps the most immediately useful for an undergraduate institution starting out from a low baseline. The third is a report by the Association of American Colleges based on case studies of about 20 distinctive college programs in non-Western studies. There are a number of other important and useful items, but from these three basic documents, the inquirer can readily find his way to both further printed sources and to living situations and experience to be tapped on campuses across the country.

Fourth, the leaders of this effort at our hypothetical, low baseline college would be well advised to examine the patterns of interinstitutional cooperation that might be available. These arrangements—the joining of forces by a number of similar institutions that are at the same early stage of development in the international field, or the linking up of several undergraduate institutions with a major university—are based on the simple but profoundly relevant principle: through such collaboration, the program totals, that is, the value to students, will be greater than the sum of the parts.

A number of interesting and promising patterns have emerged in different parts of the country. In Indiana, for example, we see a leading case of the State university taking a highly creative and comprehensive leadership role, not only for the other public and private higher institutions of the State, but also in the development of international studies at the high school level. We find also several associations of independent liberal arts colleges, two that are long established and rather formally organized being the Great Lakes Colleges Association, headed by Eldon Johnson, former president of the university of New Hampshire, with headquarters in Detroit; and the Association of Colleges of the Midwest, under the leadership of Blair Stewart, former dean of Oberlin, with offices in Chicago. Although in these two cases the cooperative development of international studies and international programs is not the exclusive purpose of the associations, it is prominent in the current activities of both. There is another approach which has been called the mother hen principle, an important example being found in the western Pennsylvania area. There was organized the Regional Council for International Education, a group of colleges geographically within reasonable distance of the University of Pittsburgh, working together on international studies developments in a cooperative arrangement fostered by that university.

This is far from exhausting the actualities or the possibilities: various patterns have already been tried and could be adapted elsewhere; some that were established for quite different purposes could be encouraged to take on responsibilities in international education; and entirely new approaches to interinstitutional cooperation could be worked out. If the size, wealth, faculty and library resources, and general strength of the particular college is sufficient, it might accomplish a good deal on an independent, self-contained basis. (Then, however, one could argue that the institution had a responsibility to assume leadership in relation to nearby and weaker colleges.) But for the rest—and that surely means most of the institutions not already developed in international studies—there is urgency in exploring opportunities to join forces with others and to gain the advantages that can be derived from cooperation, interchange, and sharing.

Turning now to the last step of my five-point strategy for institutional advance, this is the deliberate seeking of consultation and advice by well-informed individuals from other colleges, from the universities, and from private organizations—experienced educators who can contribute substantially to the institution's own planning process through a visit even of a few days. Some individuals are veritable walking reference works on the history of international developments in education over the past 20 years and are expert in appraising the situation on a particular campus and helping to focus and sharpen thinking about it. Such consultants can sometimes be made available at modest cost and can be located with the help of faculty members at a major university, through one of the area studies associations, or by a national organization such as the AAC, the Commission on International Education of the ACE, or EWA. Such bringing in of outside consultant help is not necessarily—at all times and for all colleges—an indispensible element in reaching a sound and imaginative college plan. But there are probably few cases where the quality and sharpness of the final product would not be improved as a result of folding in the added perspective of a critical yet sympathetic outside observer.

The consequence of such a five-step approach will be the emergence of a real oncampus center of expertise in the problem of college and curriculum development in the international field. Along the way, the college program leaders will become ever more knowledgeable and widely acquainted with international exchange programs and available funding opportunities; they will discover what sources may be tapped for advice and help to send faculty abroad for additional training or "exposure" in foreign cultures; to place key teachers in special summer institutes in languages or disciplinary subjects; to send student groups abroad under carefully worked out, educationally relevant programs; and to bring to the campus a foreign student contingent of appropriate size, composition, and national origin.

Across the face of America are many centers of strength and expertise, a number of existing national programs, that individual colleges or groups of colleges can draw on to support their own efforts. The main problems are learning enough about what and where these opportunities are, and then fitting all the pieces together in a careful and sensible blend—a blend which is consonant with the goals and possibilities of the particular institution, one that will assure a broadened, deepened, more lively, more rigorous, and more relevant educational experience for the students.

I want to reemphasize that these suggested guidelines do not add up to a blueprint for the development of every college, or indeed of any single college, in the international field. They merely suggest a sequence of necessary and useful steps to move the particular institution—its faculty, administration, and students—up to a point where the college can become competitive for people and funds, where it is poised for launching into self-sustaining growth, if you will, on the international front of higher education.

Without making specific reference in every sentence to the International Education Act of 1966, I have nevertheless been talking essentially about the substance of that proposed piece of legislation and its meaning for the colleges of America. Under the provisions of the act, especially of section 4, in order for colleges to qualify for grants they will have to go through a process of self-evaluation and planning along the lines of our discussion * * *. The third major point I have tried to make, therefore, is that even when colleges start from a modest baseline, there are significant and fruitful things they *can* do to achieve ultimately a solid international dimension in their curiculum and campus life. This they can do once they face up squarely to the obligation that rests on them to provide an education that prepares their students for the full responsibilities of adult citizenship in late 20th-century United States. In the last analysis, these are not only things which the colleges *can* do, they are things which the colleges *should* and *must* do, not merely to obtain Federal funds, not to curry favor with the foundations, not to evolve flashy programs to impress alumni—but simply out of the most fundamental responsibility which rests on them at this stage in the history of America and the world, an obligation they have by virtue of the very fact that they *are* institutions of higher learning. (Address, "Conference on Curricular and Instructional Innovations," Towson State College, Baltimore, Md., May 19, 1966.)

The University in World Affairs: Questions and Issues

*a report from Education and World Affairs**

In keeping with its major purpose of assisting individual U.S. universities and colleges in strengthening the international dimensions of their teaching, research, and service, Education and World Affairs undertook in 1964 and 1965 to profile the international aspects of six universities—Cornell, Indiana, Michigan State, Stanford, Tulane, and Wisconsin. The resulting book-length report, "The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities," was made widely available within the academic community. The concluding chapter attempted to focus attention on questions and issues, problems, and prospects which universities and colleges must continue to deal with as they meet the challenges of international education.

In the two decades since the end of the Second World War, when the consequences of victory swept them into the mainstream of international life, the universities of the United States have been profoundly changed. Many of the changes directly result from their approaches to world affairs. . . .

These postwar changes have in turn fostered some important issues and problems—of both substance and procedure—for universities with international interests. Some have been met squarely: others have been avoided, postponed, or turned over to a faculty committee.

The purpose of [the] concluding chapter in EWA's case studies of six American universities is to identify some of these issues and problems, and to examine them either from the experience of these universities or on the basis of general findings made during the survey.

Deliberately this chapter is not a balanced account of university accomplishments and shortcomings in the international field since the war. The universities' achievement is evident from the wide range of international activities at the six institutions covered in this survey. The intention here is not to focus on past performance but rather to raise issues that are both relevant and open for discussion—issues that in the main the universities themselves must confront and to which they must respond.

Nor is this a full catalog: rather, issues and problems have been singled out to help other universities and colleges, less involved internationally, benefit from the experience of the international activities of the more experienced. Not all the issues or problems are new—some have been raised repeatedly—but they are included in the hope that a new focus may bring them closer to solution.

Some of the problems and issues are phrased as questions. This is not only an admission that those of us who participated in this survey

---

*© 1965 Education and World Affairs, New York.

are not sure of the answers. It is also an acknowledgment that in our increasingly pluralistic system of higher education each institution tends to be unique in its background, traditions, geographic location, resources and objectives, so that no one answer, formula or plan is applicable to all, to most, or to many. Each institution must arrive at its own objectives, its own commitments, its own policies, its own depth of immersion in the international field, its own organizational arrangements to achieve order in its international activities. Institutional experiences accumulated at other universities may be relevant, but only the individual institution can decide this, from its own evolution and its own idiom.

LEADERSHIP

The international dimension of an educational institution, if it is to be meaningful, requires long-range planning and assessment and reassessment of the institution's goals and objectives. It also requires time, decisions and money—along with many other things. In fact, some aspects of internationalization, like specialized area centers, siphon off a good deal more money than most universities realize when they enter upon the commitment, because of the ever-widening nature of the activity.

The international demands therefore make leadership—at least from president, trustees, deans and key faculty—both central and critical to an effective program. The role of the leadership is to make it continually clear—inward to the university community, outward to the public—that the international dimension is a permanent, integral part of the university's total educational mission.

The format of *The University Looks Abroad*, focusing as it has on the purely international activities of six universities long involved in the field, may contribute to the impression that an educational institution's "international" dimension is a separate function, apart from the rest of the university. We cannot stress too strongly that international activities, to be successful, must be integrated into the total university. The cliches of international education are nonetheless to the point: the world *is* the proper university classroom; all literature *is* its library; international as well as domestic problems *are* its laboratories; and scholarship increasingly knows no national or cultural boundaries.

Therefore, although international studies, activities, and overseas operations all have aspects that justify special organization and attention within a university institution, their successful development requires wide support within the whole university community, which in turn is enriched by the total experience. To confine international concern to anything less than the total university environment is to deprive both the international aspects and the university itself of full benefits.

Given total university involvement, coordination, and direction of the international dimension then become major administrative responsibilities. How to achieve this, however, is less important than the atmosphere: the creation of a favorable climate of opinion is essential on any campus if the international dimension is to take hold and flourish. The best mechanics devised can seldom produce a proper atmosphere in a hostile environment.

Some central administrative concern for international activities seems essential. Over the past 8 years—and increasingly in the past year or so—more than 25 universities have found it desirable to create a central administrative organization or at the very least to designate an individual to coordinate their international activities. All but one of the six universities visited by EWA teams on this study have incorporated into their administration a top-level body responsible for international activities. These organizations range from Michigan State's highly structured (and greatly staffed) central program office, with responsibility for all the university's overseas programs, to Stanford's prestigious coordinating committee of faculty members involved in international studies or programs, headed part time by a scholar-teacher who achieves a measure of coordination by persuasion and quiet precedent.

What key considerations should a university consider in institutionalizing its international activities? Where should an international coordinating body fit into the hierarchy of university administration?

The fact that such a body or office is labeled "international" tends to set it apart on campus, rather than helping integrate it with all other campus activities.

The location and function of these coordinating offices within the university vary slightly from institution to institution, but in all universities visited where the office exists it is near the top of the administration hierarchy. This seems necessary for the successful functioning of such an office. To be most effective, it should be under the immediate supervision of the president, chancellor, presidency (when the president and vice president function as parts of a whole), provost or vice president for academic affairs, in close and direct contact with those responsible for the institution's overall as well as international policies. Furthermore, it should be clear to the faculty, students, and outside world that it has direct access to the top administration to publicize the institution's continuing commitment to internationalism.

In other words, if the goal is universitywide awareness and response to internationalizing education, a high-level location is as important for access *down* as for access *up*.

Broadly considered, a university may coordinate its international activities in two ways. One—typified here by Michigan State—is the institutionwide approach by which the administration, preferably with faculty participation, works to an overall plan and a deliberate strategy to extend the international dimension throughout the institution. The second approach—exemplified by Stanford and Indiana—is the slower, selective method of identifying and encouraging individuals, disciplines, schools, and colleges within the institution where the international dimension has already become rooted and providing the atmosphere by which they can hopefully interact.

Between these two approaches there is great diversity in the institutional mechanisms that have been developed. That is as it should be, for each campus must reflect its own character as it administers its international aspects. The great danger, as one prominent educator puts it, is that we will allow "institutional emulation to homogenize our higher educational system."[2]

COMMITMENT

In 1964 and 1965, 67 American universities were carrying out technical assistance tasks in 41 countries under 101 separate contracts with the U.S. Agency for International Development. More than $170 million was involved in these contracts. In addition, university personnel were busy all over the world performing similar but fewer technical assistance assignments for U.S. foundations. To take one specialized branch of assistance—the aid provided only by U.S. land-grant universities and colleges to help develop institutions for agricultural education and research in the lesser developed countries—over the past 15 years no fewer than 35 U.S. land-grant colleges and universities have assisted more than 50 such foreign institutions in some 30 countries.

Senator Frank Church has asked whether the United States is not suffering from "an excess of interventionism" (our troops are in 30 countries; we are pledged to defend 42; and we are extending aid, in one form or another, to nearly 100). Without espousing isolationism, are our universities overextending themselves in their international activities—or, as some contend, could they do a great deal more than they are doing now?

The president of one of the institutions visited during this study, President J. E. Wallace Sterling of Stanford, asserts that we are spreading our available higher education resources too thin in view of U.S. requirements. Despite the fact that in 1964 our universities awarded a record number of Ph. D. degrees—14,500—we simply cannot cope with the demands we are making on the college and university community, says Sterling, and therefore we keep diluting our supply to take on more and more overseas commitments. Further, the relative number of Ph. D. holders going into academic work has been steadily declining.

For perhaps the next two decades we will face critical manpower shortages in our higher educational establishments. The demand for university personnel in the public service will not lessen. To meet the demand, every institution must reassess continuously its priorities, must be willing to explore new ideas. Modified personnel procedures might permit better use of the available specialist manpower jointly by universities and the government. One such policy might be the decision to overstaff faculty to release an estimated percentage each year for overseas assignments. Another might be a decision to restrict the absence from the campus of more than an approved percentage of faculty members. Universities might also try using government personnel, foreign service officers and government specialists on home leave, or journalists, foundation experts and businessmen with international experience who could be given short-term teaching assignments to offset the loan of faculty members for government tours of duty.

Have our universities—either singly or through their national associations—fully explored the possibilities of using graduate and post-doctoral students in overseas positions to ease the demand on experienced faculty? Do we really know the requirements of all the new nations—which can make the best use of senior teachers, which could utilize—and would accept—the less experienced? In one year of experience in helping staff overseas educational institutions in the developing countries, Overseas Educational Service[1] has found that sometimes teaching applicants with an M.A. are acceptable, provided agreed-upon academic standards are met. Can anything be done to alter the attitude of those new nations that insist on "prestige" teachers? Could we consider sending teams of American teachers, led by senior professors but including younger teachers?

The expansion of intercultural courses has alone contributed to severe faculty shortages and competition for scarce specialists. For instance, during the 1964–65 academic year President John A. Hannah of Michigan State reported that his university had 300 tenure vacancies it could not fill; during the same period the University of Massachusetts was seeking some 200 faculty members, and said it would consider itself lucky to find 50 of them. By no means all of these vacancies, of course, are due to intercultural expansion. Ten years ago only 50 American colleges and universities offered intercultural courses, other than languages. Today more than 700 colleges and universities offer some such courses. The growth in language teaching can be illustrated by what has happened at one expanding institution. Five years ago Michigan State offered instruction in 10 languages; today it offers about 20. Five years ago the university had some 500 language students; today it has more than 4,500.

Overcommitment is sometimes evident on the campus. In their eagerness to get into area specialization, to follow the leaders in establishing multidisciplinary centers to focus on particular regions of the world, universities in general have overlooked the resulting strain on their libraries.

Development of the specialized library collections needed to support area studies is far more complex than universities initially assume—because of the nature of area studies, if nothing else. This has been the experience of all six universities covered in this study. Most such area specializations require different kinds of library service and different types of publications from those normally provided by a university library, creating problems of language, subject specialization, staff, and procurement. Even a modest undergraduate program in a specialized area requires special publications—some in the vernacular—usually not obtainable through regular domestic booksellers and dealers. Graduate and faculty research needs go well beyond this and require masses of primary sources as well as backfiles in Western and non-Western languages.

Servicing area programs confronts a university with serious budgetary and financial problems; obviously these should be considered before any new program is begun. There are few shortcuts; it takes time and money to build a library collection adequate to a first-class area program. And, as some of the universities included in this survey have learned, the basic library costs for the support of a relatively limited area program—at least at the graduate level—are about the same as for a major program.

Library procurement is a problem that requires more extensive institutional collaboration than universities have so far achieved. Regional variants of the Farmington plan, by which college and university libraries in a given area would collaborate on purchases and share resources, and the extensive use of faculty members on overseas assignments to find and buy library materials abroad, are possibilities that should be more thoroughly explored.

---

[1] Overseas Educational Service, an affiliate of EWA, was established in 1963 to help bring together overseas vacancies in education and well-qualified persons in the American academic community. Operating under the general authority of EWA, its sponsors, in addition to EWA, are the American Council on Education and the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council and the Institute of International Education.

Allocating greater resources to new and strategically important world areas has led to some neglect of old and strategically important areas, like Western Europe and Canada. At least three of the six universities visited by EWA teams are trying to readjust the emphasis with renewed attention to these areas, but for some time to come the areas that pushed to the fore in university studies over the past decade or so—Soviet, Asian, Latin American, and African—will continue to take the major share of university support.

Then there is the problem of individual overcommitment, resulting in the "jet set professor" (described as "one who is on so many panels, has so many consultancies and administers so many contracts that a student can only talk to him on the way to the airport"). Are these itinerant faculty members—what one critic calls "a new kind of *condottieri*, mercenaries of science and scholarship hooded with doctorates and ready for hire on studies done to contract specifications"—impoverishing the teaching function? Unquestionably this off-campus involvement feeds broad advantages back to the campus, at least in enriched faculty experience; offsetting this, the constant turnover of academic personnel, the rotation of top people to and from the campus, and the resulting strain on the remaining teachers who pick up the burdens of their absent colleagues dilute college and university teaching.

FEEDBACK

In the universities visited for this study, few systematic efforts are being made to achieve feedback, the shorthand description of the process by which institutions analyze their overseas experiences, evaluate the results, particularly the impact on teaching and research on the home campus, and draw lessons from both.

As regards building into an overseas assignment a research component for faculty members or graduate students or both, two approaches mentioned in this study should be singled out for their deliberate effort to influence the home campus.

One is the technical assistance contract Michigan State's Institute for International Studies in Education signed with AID in 1964 to improve educational planning in Thailand. Similarly, in two of its newest undertakings with AID—in Brazil and Nigeria—the University of Wisconsin has tried to build into the contracts provisions for on-site research for credit by the university's graduate students.

A visit to any university campus will confirm the observation that it is easier to put the feedback process into words than it is to bring it about. In a sense, to lament the absence of feedback is merely another way of noting that a major university is large and complex.

One major obstacle to feedback is that the faculty at work on the university's behalf abroad and the faculty concerned with teaching students and doing research in the international field on the home campus are generally from diverse parts of the university. Much of the overseas technical assistance work is in the hands of the professional schools, whereas much of the international work on campus is the province of language specialists, humanists, and social scientists, working through area centers, international affairs programs, and essentially the colleges of arts and sciences and the general graduate schools of the institutions. In the nature of the university the faculty of the professional schools on the one hand and the faculty of the arts and sciences colleges on the other do not have much in common, seldom talk much to each other, often do not know each other and only rarely work together on common projects.

Bridging this campus gap is thus the first step toward achieving feedback from international activities. Some progress is being made on the job, as the "production" scientist from the professional schools and the social scientists find themselves working together overseas and discovering in the process that technical problems frequently respond to nontechnical solutions and the reverse. However, consciously to explore all the ways institutional feedback can be drawn from overseas activities and then to put them into action in the mainstream of the learning processes on the home campus requires both a mechanism and a strategy.

Of the universities surveyed here, Michigan State has made the most significant attempt to solve the problem of feedback, not merely by establishing its Office of International Programs, but by employing it consciously and deliberately to link the diverse parts of the university.

One frequently overlooked feedback is in students who return to the home campus after months or even years of study abroad, and foreign students or visiting foreign research scholars. On few campuses are either systematically used as an educational resource. Few universities seem to have systematically or purposefully studied the impact of their study programs abroad on courses and degrees—for instance, how many returning students change their majors because of exposure abroad, or continue into graduate work, or enter international service careers? Stanford proposes to undertake such a survey of its own students, and Tulane is evaluating its junior year abroad program with some of these considerations in mind.

Nationally, there is need for an overall feedback in which all university technical assistance programs abroad—the unsuccessful as well as the successful—are systematically studied and evaluated. The foreign aid files in Washington and at the key universities are bulging with field reports, end-of-project surveys, and other materials brought back from projects abroad. The time is long past for a thorough analysis and assessment of what the university contract system has and has not accomplished, both toward overseas development goals and toward the academic development of American institutions.

RESISTANCE

Resistance to embarking on or furthering a university's world role takes many forms, and no two of the campuses visited by EWA teams had had quite the same experience in countering or overcoming opposition within the institution, whether from faculty or administration.

Can we therefore generalize about resistance? Is it a generational phenomenon? Is it found more in certain disciplines than in others? Is it geographic, or sectional—is it easier to introduce the international dimension at educational institutions on the east and west coasts than in the South and Midwest?

Sweeping generalizations merely obscure the complex picture. Although the social sciences—anthropology, history, and political science in particular—were relatively quick to adapt to the postwar concept of area studies, there have been exceptions, and, within disciplines, there are differences from university to university. Thus while economists have gained a reputation for being notoriously resistant to such special techniques as area studies, on certain campuses the economists have led their universities into international and human resource development work. On some campuses the most entrenched opposition to further internationalization comes from the humanities, particularly the conservative language departments.

Often what is often construed as resistance on the part of a department or faculty member toward internationalizing the curriculum or the staff is in essence an honest difference of opinion or at least a different view of priorities.

How much of what is taken as resistance to international involvement on some campuses is merely what John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, calls "the deep-seated aversion of many faculty members to extensive innovation within the institution"? Says Gardner: "Most faculty members are enthusiastic proponents of innovation in the abstract, but the slogan carved over the mantlepiece at the faculty club reads 'Innovate Away From Home.' If you must innovate, try West Pakistan."

INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM

Despite some advances in internationalizing the curriculum over the past 20 years, the gap is widening between the demands and needs of the United States in a world society and the ability of American education to meet them. The international dimension in the college and university curriculum is more visible than ever before, yet the influence on the students seems discouragingly slight.

A 1962 inquiry sent to 683 liberal arts colleges then members of the Association of American Colleges revealed that 282, or 41 percent, offered varying options to learn about non-Western cultures; however, most of these courses were electives taken by fewer than 5 to 10 percent of the students. Continued parochialism emerged in a similar 1964 survey, which indicated that fewer than 10 percent of the students in liberal arts and other 4-year colleges offering courses on the non-Western world actually took such courses. Fewer than 1 percent studied a non-Western language—this despite the fact that 70 percent of the liberal arts colleges and roughly 50 percent of the other 4-year institutions offered at least one and usually several such courses. However, most of these courses were upper-class electives not required of majors or for graduation.

Fewer than 2 dozen of our 1,500 universities or 4-year colleges seem to require all candidates for the baccalaureate to take even a single course dealing primarily with the non-Western areas. For most of these students these few courses are terminal as well as introductory. And if these courses are limited to liberal arts students, the parochialism is increased: At any given moment about half our undergraduates are taking their 4 baccalaureate years in a professional school, where exposure to international course content is generally even more restricted.

How to make intercultural materials and the study of international affairs part of a liberal education for all college graduates still concerns only a minority of faculty and administration. The pressure to find adequate remedies will continue to mount, but the need will not be met until more educational leaders become committed to its importance and devise effective ways to meet it.

The most obvious way to attack is to include appropriate international materials in the introductory, general education courses in history, the social sciences, and the humanities. These are the principal traffic courses in the undergraduate curriculum.

Drawing on the six universities surveyed here, the integrated social science course revised to take in a substantial international component that is required of all undergraduates at Michigan State's University College offers a model for the inclusion of appropriate international content in heavy traffic courses. However, at all the universities visited—which are in the front rank in international curriculum—many approaches are used to strengthen the international dimension in undergraduate education. Among these are the development of new intercultural courses; the addition of specialized area or comparative courses on the history, politics, social organization, and literature of non-Western areas; the establishment of multidisciplinary area studies, primarily at the graduate level but open on some campuses to undergraduates; the expansion and strengthening of foreign language study, particularly of non-Western languages; and programs of undergraduate study abroad.

STUDENTS AND WORLD AFFAIRS

Undergraduate study abroad arouses mixed emotions on most campuses. At the six visited by EWA teams the viewpoints ranged from those of observers who see study-abroad programs, provided they are organized and directed, as an integral part of undergraduate education, to those who judge overseas study programs as primarily touristic experiences.

Can the universities themselves do anything to curb the uncontrolled, uncoordinated, ill-prepared spread of undergraduate study-abroad programs? Until 1950 only half a dozen such programs existed, mostly of the junior year abroad type. By 1965 they had grown in scope and number until they now cover approximately 30,000 students each year.

The alarming proliferation, the duplication of effort, and, in certain areas, the academic illegitimacy of study abroad "threatens to become a national educational scandal," according to Stephen A. Freeman, who did a study for the Consultative Service on U.S. Undergraduate Study Abroad. And, apart from the problems of lack of coordination in overseas offerings and impositions on foreign universities, to mention only two of the major problems involved in study abroad, are any univeristies addressing themselves to the larger question: How is the the foreign experience obtained merged into the mainstream of education on the home campus?

Even when there are on-campus stimuli for worldwide interests—Peace Corps, Operation Crossroads Africa, international student exchanges, study abroad programs, and the like—the problem arises of how to direct this general student interest into a specific academic program. In general, students seem to have trouble identifying courses with international content, from most college and university catalogs, which often describe these courses inadequately. One solution is to group these courses in a separate, supplemental international course catalog, so that a student with an international bent can design a program to meet both his interests and his discipline requirements. Cornell now prepares and issues biennially a special catalog, titled *International Studies at Cornell University: Courses of Instruction*. Stanford is preparing a similar supplement.

FOREIGN STUDENTS

Foreign students are no longer a novelty on most American campuses, but few institutions where they are present in fair numbers seem to have given much thought to the fundamental issues of what is loosely called the foreign student problem. Too, foreign students present more than an educational problem: their concerns—and concern for them—extend well beyond the academic.

Merely including foreign nationals in the student body does not relieve the admitting institution of further responsibility. The presence of foreign students on campus should be the result of a carefully thought out rationale, and their academic program should be an integral part of the institution's educational strategy.

There were about 85,000 foreign students in the United States in 1965. Of these probably only 15 to 20 percent had really planned an effective sponsorship, and many were either chronically hard pressed financially or were just barely meeting their annual expenses. The prediction is that foreign students at American institutions will increase to 100,000 or even 150,000 over the next 5 years, with no ceiling in sight. This growth is expected at a time when an ever-greater number of American students will be seeking higher education.

That the entire foreign student problem in the United States requires national attention and study as well as individual institutional planning was the main finding of a 1964 report by EWA, *The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?*

None of the universities included in this survey seem to have very coherent plans for relating their interests to foreign student needs or competences. In some, foreign students appear to be admitted in a haphazard, unplanned manner from among those who happen to apply in one way or another for admission. At most of the universities surveyed, foreign graduate students are admitted by decision of the colleges and departments concerned: there is no all-university coordination and, therefore, no control over numbers admitted, or over the desired mix between graduate and undergraduate applicants.

Some universities apparently have quietly imposed a quota on foreign students—sometimes in response to or in anticipation of criticism from constituents, State legislatures, the press, alumni, and so on over the admission of out-of-State and foreign students at a time when facilities for American students are in short supply. None of the six universities covered in this survey have instituted a fixed quota, although two or three use a rule of thumb to limit their proportion of foreign students to not more than 10 percent of total enrollment.

The questions growing from concern with the foreign student problem have repeatedly been pinpointed.

Are foreign student applicants being properly selected and screened in their home countries? Are our institutions maintaining reasonably high admission standards in admitting those who come here? Are foreign students coming to the United States at the proper level of their educational development? Are they being placed in the appropriate schools when they get here? Are they sufficiently oriented in advance to our educational system, customs, institutions, and values; and is their command of English sufficient to enable them to hold their own with American students under competitive conditions?

Many of our services and activities need improvement badly. Perhaps equally important, foreign students must be better selected before they leave their home countries. The educational and manpower needs of the students' home countries also deserve careful consideration. The lack of adequate overseas facilities for proper screening is one of the greatest weaknesses of the present loose arrangement. With this in mind EWA has sponsored a study of the feasibility of establishing overseas field offices to serve the various needs of American colleges and universities. The functions to be performed by such offices might include screening and selection services for foreign students wishing to study in the United States, services for visiting American scholars and students, and information to American colleges and universities about the local educational scene.

Once in the United States, how much assistance should foreign students receive from their host institutions? What special services should a university reasonably provide?

Many extra duties have been undertaken by foreign student advisers' offices: with increasing numbers of foreign students and mounting costs, these should be continually reexamined to determine their real legitimacy. Virtually every step in the educational process—from the initial contact, to screening, to enrollment, through academic counseling, to reentry and effective employment in the home country, and the continuation of alumni relations—requires special treatment and modification to match the needs of individual students from abroad. Yet in some colleges and universities the mere designation of a foreign student adviser—a procedure followed by some 600 institutions—often seems to relieve the rest of the institution of any further responsibility for its foreign students.

Are universities ever justified in adjusting their academic standards to meet the needs of their foreign students? Do some institutions, in fact, operate a double standard without admitting it? At one major university with a high percentage of foreign students, a survey over a 2-year period revealed that 28 percent of the foreign graduate students were failing, a rate twice that of the all-university average for failing students. A followup survey revealed that in the second quarter of the year just over half the foreign students who were below satisfactory performance in the first quarter were still in school and that many had dropped further in their grade point average. As for undergraduates, the study found that students performing just below or barely at a satisfactory academic level may be having their greatest difficulty in their declared major. The study suggests that universities tend to treat foreign students the same as American students in certain areas of university administration where their "foreignness" demands different treatment, and that in the more academic areas they tend to treat the foreign student differently—and usually more generously—when more equal treatment might be in the better interest of both student and university.

This in turn raises the question whether the academic programs prescribed for foreign students will, in fact, prepare them for their roles back in their home culture. We must examine these products of our educational system back in their home countries to learn more about the applicability of American education to the rest of the world, particularly its developing areas. And there is a further question: Do foreign students, in fact, return to their home countries at the completion of their studies? Do some nations have a higher rate of "nonreturnees" than others, and if so, why? Are undergraduate foreign students more likely to remain in the United States than graduate students? Among possible alternatives, should we or the home countries consider some form of "return scholarships" as inducements to persuade American-trained foreign students to return and contribute their newly acquired skills to the development of their own nations?

What are the pros and cons of a university's utilizing its alumni in foreign lands to assist in screening and selecting student applicants? On occasion, Wisconsin's graduate school and various departments do tap alumni for this assistance; Indiana is considering mobilizing its foreign alumni more systematically than it has in the past; and Tulane is considering calling on its graduates in Latin America to do preliminary screening of prospective applicants.

Can foreign students be used while in America as educational resources, either in intercultural studies or through extracurricular programs? Are there any instructive instances of the imaginative use of the resources of foreign students or scholars? Disappointingly, although our educational institutions have played host to foreign students for decades—even on a small scale in the years between the wars—no systematic study has been made of the contribution foreign students make toward international understanding on the part of American students. Nor, for that matter, does there appear to have been a nationwide study of the contribution to international understanding foreign students make to foreign students of a different nation on the same campus, or to students of their own nation.

COMPETENCE

Few if any our universities can claim to have all the resources and competences for all the complex technical assistance programs they have been invited to undertake either by the U.S. Government or by the foundations. The real problem for a major university is not only to determine what it can and should do overseas, but to decide what it cannot and should not do. If a university undertakes to do abroad all that is asked of it, it may end by destroying itself. As one dean at Stanford has put it: "In the long run other institutions can be created to perform that part of the economic and social development function that is not congenial to universities, but * * * there are not and cannot be other institutions that perform the functions of the university."

The capabilities of American universities abroad have on occasion been severely stretched even when faculty members engaged in activities they knew best: the universities' effectiveness is made more problematic when these same professors are expected to engage in direct managerial operations that are only vaguely and remotely related to teaching and research.

There is also a tendency—perhaps stemming back to the betweenwars provincialism of the average American campus—to assume that American principles and operating experiences can be transferred overseas wholesale. Too often we seem to bring a "made-in-America" solution to problems that simply do not respond to this approach. Put another way, the technical aid we offer is often too sophisticated for the recipient country's economy. For instance, simply importing American technology and educational methods will not solve the subtle problems of life in Africa's rural areas, where most of the continent's people live. Similarly, advance techniques of educational development often overlook the basic need to communicate with and to change the minds and mores of the people undergoing development. Teaching literacy, for instance, is not enough: these who are being taught to read must have the basic reading materials on which to practice their new skills.

University competence in the international field is not evenly distributed. The present development of language and area centers, a notable achievement in itself, nonetheless provides uneven coverage of important non-Western countries and regions, and in some cases there is scarcely any systematic coverage. First-class regional study centers are needed to cover such areas and countries as north Africa, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Soviet Asia, the Philippines, Vietnam, and Korea. Also, there is no effective division of labor among our universities covering African and Latin American studies. Latin American studies are now offered at more than 30 universities, but only about a dozen afford the quality of scholarship common among other non-Western area centers, and of the dozen that have become major centers in the past few years perhaps 6 can be classed as first rank.

What can universities do among themselves (with or without foundation finance) to fill the gaps, spread the coverage, and share the responsibilities?

Individual faculty competence should not be overlooked. Although the knowledge explosion has not hit international affairs with the same intensity as it has the sciences, rethinking international subject matter is necessary from time to time, especially as half a hundred new nations have appeared in the world society over the past few years.

Arrangements are made on many campuses for professionals and businessmen to return occasionally for updating and retraining. Can we afford to do less for faculty members? Faculty members' competence in the international field can be extended by such means as faculty seminars, visiting scholars, or interinstitutional cooperation combined with study abroad. It may be a matter of reorienting the interest of a faculty member, or rediscovering some rusty skills, or stretching the boundaries of his discipline, or developing a new competence altogether.

OVERSEA CONTRACT OPERATIONS

Is too much reliance being placed on the university as the "chosen instrument" in handling technical aid overseas? During this study a clear impression persisted that the AID-university contract relationship runs on bureaucratic momentum and is a convenience to both parties. Foreign aid administrators admit that no Government agency can equal the university in the mobilization and skilled use of academic personnel, in bringing resources and talent to bear on problems. In general, the university contract has been successful beyond expectations. But there are also problems inherent in the contract system.

For one, AID contracts seem to have a homing instinct, resulting in extremely uneven participation in oversea educational activities among the 1,500 or so 4-year American colleges and universities. Over and over, those responsible for placing oversea contracts seem to turn to the same major universities, even to the same professional and graduate schools within them. This not only places an impossible burden on the few institutions involved, but also overlooks the possible contributions of many other institutions. At present, for instance, it is not easy for the individual faculty member of a small liberal arts institution, highly qualified and motivated though he may be, to enter oversea service. An instrumentality through which the resources of the small institution can be channeled into overseas assistance was needed, and it was in part to meet this need that Overseas Educational Service was established.

The very convenience of the AID-university contract relationship may discourage the agency from thoroughly exploring and considering the use of nonuniversity contract groups to carry out as many of the technical assistance programs as possible and so preserve scarce university resources.

In his report *AID and the Universities* (a study mounted and staffed by EWA) John Gardner, then president of the Carnegie Corp. of New York, recommended that the Government examine the possibilities of recruiting in nonuniversity areas—industrial laboratories, museums, research institutions of various sorts. Also, the U.S. Government has never adequately explored the possibility of tapping the reservoir of 2,300,000 Federal employees, or examined the possibilities and legal complications of calling on State and local employees for service overseas.

State governments and education departments have also tended to neglect the international dimensions of education at home, as well as the potentially rich academic benefits that might accrue to their systems from State department of education staff members or teachers returning from oversea teaching, research, and service activities under oversea contract or other auspices. New York State—with its pioneer Office of Foreign Area Studies—California, Florida, Indiana, and Pennsylvania exemplify others that have taken notable steps to infuse the international dimension into their systems. Far more needs to be done in these fields, however.

Is there a role for universities in identifying and making known to the Government talents and competencies from nonuniversity sources that could be mobilized for oversea operations? Could universities do more to marshal talent from colleges or even public schools in their areas for assignments overseas? In some areas of expertise—for instance, the applied use of educational television, programed learning and advanced teaching techniques—some American public school bodies are ahead of some universities and at the same time are closer to the real educational needs of the emerging countries. In communications, it should not be necessary to turn again and again to the same few universities for aid in establishing radio networks, educational television programs, or indigenous publishing ventures. The efforts of Franklin Book Programs to stimulate better indigenous publishing may offer a model for comparable enterprises in allied fields.

In academic assistance overseas, should we try to upgrade whole foreign educational institutions instead of working piecemeal in a department-to-department, school-to-school relationship? In other words, is not an attempt to improve the quality of one department or college of a foreign university doomed from the beginning if the other units of the same institution are not improved at the same time and to the same degree?

What are the possibilities of using a semiuniversity or even nonuniversity organization to carry out most of the housekeeping details of a university's oversea contract, thus freeing the university personnel to pursue basic research or teaching assignments? Stanford is experimenting on a small scale along these lines with the Stanford Research Institute. The results will be scrutinized both in Washington and throughout the university community.

ORIENTATION

Two decades have passed since the first crash program threw university personnel into oversea assignments without adequate predeparture preparation and orientation, yet during that time surprisingly little attention has been given to preparing university personnel to live and work abroad.

Not one of the universities visited in this survey operates a systematic program of orientation for educational service abroad. Michigan State, which has been as aware of the problem as any university in the United States and has tried several approaches to orientation, relies at present on a fairly informal indoctrination of faculty members and their families going abroad on contract work. Wisconsin tried out an intensive briefing session for its faculty members going to Nigeria in 1965, and intends to follow up with a study of results.

There is no consensus on what makes up the necessary predeparture orientation, or on whether a followup briefing in the country of assignment is essential. Extremes range all the way from a brief exposure to guidebook literature—the Temple Fielding approach—to the total immersion of 9 long months that missionaries heading overseas for some years undergo at the Missionary Orientation Center at Stony Point, N.Y. The need for something in between in training and preparation seems to be recognized year after year by many university bodies.

The 1962–63 annual report of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) noted that exploratory discussions had been held among its member universities—the Big Ten universities plus the University of Chicago—on possible joint action in training professors for oversea assignments. * * * In their November 1963 draft proposal to the Ford Foundation for funds, the Midwest Universities Consortium (MUCIA) recommended establishing a cooperative orientation and training program to include intensive language training and instruction in the history, economics, and culture of the country to which the faculty member is being assigned. As the months passed, Michigan State finally took the lead in developing a proposal for a MUCIA orientation and training program, a step it hopes to get approved in 1965 or 1966.

Despite continuing indications of real need, there seems to be little response from much of the university community, in ideas or action, beyond the classic solution to an unwelcome chore: propose, dispose, repose.

INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION

Universities and colleges are discovering that self-sufficiency is no longer the unqualified academic virtue it once was. Increasingly, institutions are turning to cooperative ventures, student and faculty exchanges, and joint efforts covering every activity from study abroad to fund raising. At the outset of 1965 the Association of American Colleges listed 360 institutions involved in 47 different kinds of academic cooperation—and admitted that the list was already out of date.

Two of the best-known interinstitutional arrangements have been referred to frequently in this study. One is the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, launched in 1958 with support from the Carnegie Corp., to provide for voluntary cooperative arrangements among 11 midwestern universities. The other is the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc., financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation, in which four midwestern universities—Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Michigan State—agreed to pool their resources to undertake certain international activities too large for any one of them. A similar consortium, an old idea newly applied to college and university associations, is being considered for Stanford and the University of California, Berkeley, and possibly other California institutions.

Relentless financial pressures make administrations receptive to collaboration with other institutions. The biggest obstacle seems to be faculty resistance. Departmental pride or the sovereignty of the school or college involved are reefs on which many a proposal for academic partnership has been wrecked. * * *

Much more attention needs to be given to interinstitutional cooperation. Perhaps new organizational arrangements must be devised to overcome faculty resistance, to insure that there is no loss of institutional or departmental prestige or identity. In exploring the range of possible cooperative arrangements on a neighborhood, statewide, regional, national, and even overseas basis there is undoubtedly a role for the professional organizations of higher education, such as the American Council on Education, the Association for Higher Education, the Association of American Colleges, the Modern Language Association, the American Political Science Association, and Education and World Affairs.

COMMUNICATIONS

The lines of communication in educational institutions often make orderly minds despair. The same might be said of communication within the university community.

In fact, Cornell's president, James A. Perkins, who has worked both the foundation and the university sides of the street, has said it.

"The most striking feature of a university community is its relative disinterest in the educational activities of others," he has written. "The institutional life of a university is guided not by the research or publication activities of fellow professionals, but by its own educational programs and theories. These programs seem to be most difficult to transmit from one institution to another. In fact, it might be said that the individuality of each university is so tough and leathery, and their mutual disinterests so pronounced, that they have developed a rich tradition of unsuccessful effort in transmitting to one another the results of their experiments."

The communications problem of the universities has three dimensions—internal, national, and international.

Internally, the integration of the university has been whittled away by the increased specialization of its scholars. Institutional loyalty is fast decreasing and is being replaced by outside allegiances. Scholars are inclined to communicate up through their discipline, within departments, through their professional organizations and journals, and in personal contacts with scholars in the same discipline rather than within their own institution. As Perkins has said: "Specialist has called to like-minded specialist, and together they have found their long-run interests better satisfied in larger organizations elsewhere than in the university which is their home base."

Cross-university communication can no longer be taken for granted. It must be worked at—another argument for the effective operation of some kind of central coordinating office in the field of international affairs.

Foundations tend to assume that our universities interact or somehow operate in a connected fashion, and that a foundation-financed experiment that proves successful at one institution will, by what Perkins has called "a process of academic osmosis," affect the programs of other universities. If the six universities visited by EWA are typical—and they are probably as little isolated as any in the Nation—this assumption is unwarranted. Ideas simply are not transmitted from institution to institution by natural transfer: they must be moved from one to another, and for the moment they seem to rely for their movement on outside people and forces, rather than on the universities themselves.

The role of higher education in world affairs requires international collaboration among universities, but it is demonstrable today that Government agencies, businesses, and nongovernmental organizations know more about their opposite numbers in other nations than do our universities and colleges. American educational institutions generally lack an intimate knowledge of their counterparts abroad, especially of the requirements and standards their diplomas and degrees represent, and at least until recently—when the U.S. Office of Education moved to make its accumulated files of comparative education materials more widely available—we could not make what knowledge we had about our neighbors available to our own higher education system.

The communication challenge must be met. We need new, improved mechanisms for communication within universities, among universities, and between the universities and the world outside. This may mean developing new organizational structures within universities and new patterns of relationship within the higher education community.

The communication gap is among the most serious of the unsolved problems encountered by EWA teams on campus visits. This study—like Education and World Affairs itself—was undertaken to help close the gap. Failure to bridge it will mean, at best, inability to share common experiences, and, at worst, continued institutional parochialism.

(*The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities.*)

BIBLIOGRAPHY*[1]

- I. **Higher Education and World Affairs:**
  - A. **General.**
  - B. **Role of College and University.**
  - C. **Role of Government.**
  - D. **Role of Foundations.**
- II. **Curriculum:**
  - A. **Internationalizing the Curriculum.**
  - B. **Language and Area Studies.**
  - C. **Library Resources.**
  - D. **Teacher Training.**
  - E. **Research.**
- III. **Educational Exchanges:**
  - A. **General.**
  - B. **Foreign Students.**
  - C. **U.S. Students Abroad.**
  - D. **Faculty and Scholar Exchange.**
- IV. **U.S. Oversea Activities:**
  - A. **Role of Education in Developing Countries.**
  - B. **Role of University in Technical Assistance.**
    - 1. **General.**
    - 2. **AID Contracts.**
    - 3. **Peace Corps.**
- V. **Cooperative Educational Efforts**
- VI. **Resource Materials:**
  - A. **Reference Works.**
  - B. **Bibliographies.**

---

[1] CONSULTANTS TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

George M. Beckmann, associate dean of faculties, University of Kansas.
Robert F. Byrnes, director, International Affairs Center, Indiana University.
Prof. William Theodore de Bary, Department of Chinese and Japanese, Columbia University.
Royden Dangerfield, director of international programs, University of Illinois.
Prof. Stephen Freeman, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
John B. Howard, director, program in international training and research, the Ford Foundation.
Frederick Jackson, vice president for the humanities and social sciences, New York University.
Eldon L. Johnson, president, Great Lakes Colleges Association.
Ward Morehouse, director, Office of Foreign Area Studies, Center for International Programs and Services, University of the State of New York.
Albert Sims, College Entrance Examining Board.
Prof. Milton Singer, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago.
Ralph H. Smuckler, dean, Office of International Programs, Michigan State University.
Russell I. Thackrey, executive director, National Association of State Universities & Land-Grant Colleges.

*©1966, Education and World Affairs, New York.

I. HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS

A. General

Bailey, Stephen K. "International Education: Shadow and Substance." School of Education annual spring lecture, Cornell University, April 30, 1963 (mimeo).

Baskin, Samuel (ed.). *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Bowles, Frank. "American Responsibilities in International Education." *Educational Record,* vol. 45, winter 1964, pp. 19–26.

——— Untitled speech presented at the White House Conference on International Cooperation, Washington, D.C., November 28–December 1, 1965.

Butts, R. Freeman. *American Education in International Development.* New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Coombs, Philip H. *The Fourth Dimension of Foreign Policy: Educational and Cultural Affairs.* New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

——— "The International Dimensions of United States Education." Address delivered before the Conference on the Ideals of American Freedom and the International Dimensions of Education, Washington, D.C., March 27, 1962 (revised).

"Education as an Instrument of National Goals." *Phi Delta Kappan,* vol. XLVII, December 1965 (entire issue).

Education Without Boundaries. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Frankel, Charles. *The Neglected Aspect of Foreign Affairs: American Educational and Cultural Policy Abroad.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1965.

Harari, Maurice. "The Role of Higher Education in World Affairs." Speech delivered at the annual conference of the Louisiana State colleges and universities, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, March 5, 1965.

Higher Education. Report of the Committee on Higher Education under the chairmanship of Lord Robbins, 1961–63. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1964.

Laves, Walter, H. C. and Charles A. Thompson. *Cultural Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963.

Marvel, William W. "The Triple-Threat Force of Education." Speech delivered at the annual Founder's Day convocation, North Carolina College, Durham, November 2, 1964.

McClelland, Charles A. *College Teaching of International Relations: Problems of Organization and Collaboration.* San Francisco: Department of International Relations, San Francisco State College, 1962.

Phillips, Claude S., Jr. "The Present World Challenge to Higher Education." *The Educational Record,* vol. XLIV, July 1963, pp. 266–274.

Robb, Felix C. "Education of Americans for International Cooperation." Speech presented at the White House Conference on International Cooperation, Washington, D.C., November 30, 1965.

Taylor, Harold. "The Idea of a World College." *Saturday Review,* vol. 47, November 14, 1964, pp. 29–32.

Ward, F. Champion. "Editorial Comment—The Marco Polo Curriculum." *Journal of General Education,* vol. XIII, January 1962, pp. 221–223.

"White House Conference on Education: A Milestone for Educational Progress." Report on the White House Conference on Education, July 20–21, 1965, prepared for the subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Wilson, Howard E., and Florence H. Wilson. *American Higher Education and World Affairs.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963.

B. Role of College and University

The College and University in International Affairs. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1960 (reprinted from the 1959–60 annual report).

The Committee on the College and World Affairs. *The College and World Affairs.* John W. Nason, chairman. New York: Education and World Affairs (for the Hazen Foundation), 1964.

The Committee on the University and World Affairs. *The University and World Affairs.* J. L. Morrill, chairman. New York: The Ford Foundation, 1960.

Frankel, Charles (ed.). *Issues in University Education.* New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Gardner, John W. "The Future of the University." *Saturday Review,* vol. XLVI, November 2, 1963.

——— "The University in Our Civilization." Speech presented at the 42d annual meeting of the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., October 8, 1959.

Henry, David D. "The American University Looks Abroad: View from the President's Office." Paper delivered at the regional Conference of Education and World Affairs, East Lansing, Mich., October 11, 1963.

The International Programs of American Universities. Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1958. Revised edition, prepared by the Institute of Advanced Projects of the East-West Center, Margaret Cormack (comp.), to be published by Michigan State University Office of International Programs, fall 1966.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Marvel, William W. "A Dilemma for Our Colleges and Universities: Domestic Demands and Overseas Needs." Speech presented at the 18th Annual Conference on Higher Education of NEA, Chicago, March 3, 1963.

——— "Colleges and the Proposed International Education Act of 1966." Speech delivered at the Intercollegiate Regional Conference on Undergraduate Education and World Affairs, University of Iowa, Iowa City, April 22, 1966.

——— "The University in World Affairs: An Introduction." *The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities."* New York: Walker & Co. (for Education and World Affairs), 1966, p. xi–xx.

Miller, Paul A. "The Role of the University in Developing World Community." Speech delivered at the American Sociological Association, Chicago, Ill., September 2, 1965.

Muller Steven. "The Enlisted University," Address before the 12th annual meeting of the Cornell University Council on *The Role of the University in Promoting Change,* October 5–6, 1962, Ithaca, N.Y., pp. 24–35.

"The National Foreign Policy Conference for Educators, Washington, D.C., June 16–17, 1966." *Department of State Bulletin,* July 18, 1966 (entire issue).

Neal, Joe W. "Developing the International Office." *Overseas,* April 1964, pp. 7–11.

Nostrand, Howard L. and Francis J. Brown (eds.). *The Role of Colleges and Universities in International Understanding.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1949.

Taylor, George E. "The Leadership of the Universities." The *Annals* of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1964, pp. 1–11.

The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities. New York: Walker & Co. (for Education and World Affairs), 1966.

Weidner, Edward W. *The World Role of Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

C. Role of Government

American Assembly. *Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations,* edited by Robert Blum. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Battle, Lucius D. "Education: Passkey to the Future." Speech before the Third Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education of the Organization of American States, Bogotá, Colombia, August 4, 1963 (mimeo).

Coombs, Philip H. *Strengthening the Educational and Cultural Component of United States Foreign Policy: A report to the Secretary of State.* Washington, D.C., June 5, 1962.

Cotner, Thomas E. *A Summary of the Exchange and Training Programs Administered by the Bureau of International Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1939–1964.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1964.

Educational and Cultural Diplomacy. Washington, D.C.: Department of State (annual).

Fraser, Stewart (ed.). *Governmental Policy and International Education: a Symposium.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965.

Haviland, H. Field, Jr. "Federal Programs of International Education." *Higher Education and the Federal Government,* edited by Charles G. Dobbins. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963, pp. 76–88.

International Education Program, 1966. New York: Education and World Affairs, March 1966.

Laves, Walter H. C. *Toward a National Effort in International and Cultural Affairs.* 87th Congress, 1st Session. House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Doc. No. 199. Also, in slightly abbreviated form, a pamphlet in the International Information and Cultural Series 78, Department of State Publication 7238, 1961.

Laves, Walter H. C., and Charles A. Thompson. *UNESCO: Purpose, Progress, Prospects.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957.

Mildenberger, Kenneth W. "The Federal Government and the Universities." The *Annals* of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1964, pp. 23–29.

Pusey, Nathan. "The Carnegie Study of the Federal Government and Higher Education." *Higher Education and the Federal Government,* edited by Charles G. Dobbins. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963, pp. 17–29.

Report of the Committee on Culture and Intellectual Exchange. The White House Conference on International Cooperation, November 28–December 1, 1965.

The U.S. Office of Education: A New International Dimension. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964.

Wells, Herman B. "Widening Horizons." *Educational Record,* vol. 38, April 1957, pp. 136–40.

D. Role of Foundations

Beckmann, George M. "The Role of the Foundations." The *Annals* of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1964, pp. 12–22.

Thompson, Kenneth W. "American Education and the Developing Areas." The *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 365, July 1966.

II. CURRICULUM

A. Internationalizing the Curriculum

AACTE Handbook of International Education Programs. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1963.

Anderson, Wallace L. "Undergraduate International Programs: A Rationale and an Approach." Speech delivered at the Intercollegiate Regional Conference on Undergraduate Education and World Affairs, University of Iowa, Iowa City, April 22, 1966.

Bidwell, Percy W. "Foreign Affairs in the Colleges." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 35, November 1964, pp. 426–433.

——— *Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs.* New York: King's Crown Press, 1962.

——— "The World Affairs Content of American Higher Education." Paper given at the Education and World Affairs Regional Conference of College and University Leaders, Michigan State University, Kellogg Center, East Lansing, Mich., October 10–11, 1963.

Bigelow, Donald. "The Center Concept and the Changing Curriculum." *Higher Education*, vol. XVIII, July 1962 (reprint).

Buehrig, Edward H. "Implications for the Undergraduate Curriculum of the Growing Importance of International Affairs and the Mounting Need To Understand World Cultures." *1961: Current Issues in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1961.

The Challenge of a Revolutionary World: Progress Report. Albany, N.Y.: State Education Department (annual).

deBary, William Theodore. "Education for a World Community." *Liberal Education*, vol. 50, December 1964, pp. 437–457.

Hickman, Warren L. "Retooling for a New Liberal Arts Program." *Liberal Education*, vol. L, March 1964, pp. 22–27.

Kirk, Grayson. *The Study of International Relations in American Colleges and Universities.* New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1947.

Long, Harold M., and Robert N. King. *Improving the Teaching of World Affairs: The Glens Falls Story.* Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, Bulletin No. 35, 1964.

Mangone, Gerard J. "How Can We Better Educate Americans to Work and to Study Abroad." *1960: Current Issues in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1960.

Marvel, William W. "Relating International Developments to the Undergraduate Curriculum." Speech delivered at the Conference on Curricular and Instructional Innovations, Towson State College, Baltimore, Md., May 19, 1966.

McClelland, Charles A. *College Teaching of International Relations: Problems of Organization and Collaboration.* San Francisco: Department of International Relations, San Francisco State College, 1962.

Morehouse, Ward. *The International Dimensions of Education in New York State.* Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1963.

——— "The Pinebrook Experiment." *Liberal Education*, vol. L, December 1965 (reprint).

Newsletter of The American Council of Learned Societies. September 1961; December 1961; and January 1962.

"Proceedings of the Conference of the California State Colleges in cooperation with Education and World Affairs, January 28–29, 1966," on *The International Dimension in the California State Colleges*, Los Angeles, 1966.

Rothwell, C. Easton. "The World in Higher Education." Speech delivered at the Conference of the California State Colleges in cooperation with Education and World Affairs on *The International Dimension in California State Colleges*, Los Angeles, January 28–29, 1966.

Swift, Richard N. *World Affairs and the College Curriculum.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Teacher and Curriculum. Report of the Conference on American Education in a Revolutionary World held at Gould House, Dobbs Ferry, New York, April 22–24, 1964, under the joint sponsorship of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO and the New York State Education Department. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, 1964.

Tyrell, William G. "Developing International Understanding in the First Two Years of College," edited by Howard R. Anderson. *Approaches to an Understanding of World Affairs,* 25th yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: The council, 1954, pp. 383–395.

Ward, F. Champion. "Toward a Universal Curriculum." *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans,* 1962, pp. 32–35.

Wilson, Howard E. *American College Life as an Education in World Outlook.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956.

——— *Universities and World Affairs.* New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1951.

B. Language and Area Studies

"African Studies in the United States." *African Studies Bulletin,* vol. IV, May 1961, pp. 9–20.

Allen, Virginia French (ed.). *On Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: Series I.* Papers read at the TESOL Conference, Tucson, Ariz., May 8–9, 1964. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

American Council of Learned Societies and Social Science Research Council, Joint Committee on Southern Asia. *Southern Asia Studies in the United States: A Survey and a Plan.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951.

Area Studies and the Library. Proceedings of the Conference on Area Studies and the Library sponsored by the University of Chicago, May 20–22, 1965. *The Library Quarterly,* vol. 35, October 1965 (entire issue).

Axelrod, Joseph and Donald Bigelow. *Resources for Language and Area Studies.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1962.

Bailey, Jackson. "Non-Western Studies in the Small Liberal Arts College: An Experiment at Earlham and Antioch Colleges." *Liberal Education,* vol XLVI, October 1961, pp. 405–11.

Beckmann, George M. "Guidelines for an Experimental Curriculum with Major Emphasis on Non-Western Cultures." *Current Issues in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1964 (reprint).

Bennett, Wendell C. *Area Studies in American Universities.* New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951.

Bigelow, Donald N., and Lyman H. Legters. *NDEA Language and Area Centers: A Report on the First 5 Years.* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

Bigelow, Donald N. and Lyman H. Legters (eds.). "The Non-Western World in Higher Education." The *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 356, November 1964 (entire issue).

Bingham, Woodbridge. "An Integrated Approach to an All-Asia Survey Course." *Association of American Colleges Bulletin,* vol XLIV, October 1958, pp. 1–8.

Black, C. E., and John M. Thompson (eds.). *American Teaching About Russia.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959.

Boardman, Eugene (ed.). *Asian Studies in Liberal Education: The Teaching of Asian History and Civilizations to Undergraduates.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1959.

Borton, Hugh. "Asian Studies and the American Colleges." *Journal of Asian Studies,* vol. XVIII, November 1958, pp. 59–65.

Byrnes, Robert F. "Teaching Materials for Foreign Area Instruction." *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. XLVII, December 1965, pp. 224–227.

——— (ed.). *The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana.* Indiana University Publications, Slavic and East European Series, vol. XV, 1959.

Caldwell, Oliver J. "Some Comments on Possible Experimental Curricula with Major Emphasis on Non-Western Cultures." *1964: Current Issues in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1964 (reprint).

Chu Yu-kuang. "The Liberal Values of Non-Western Studies." *Topic: 3. Education and Culture.* Washington, Pennsylvania: Washington and Jefferson College, Spring 1962, pp. 25–34.

Cline, Howard F. (comp.). *Latin American Studies in the United States.* Proceedings of a meeting held in Chicago, Nov. 6–8, 1958. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Hispanic Foundation, 1959.

Commission on International Understanding. *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1964.

Conference on Critical Languages in Liberal Arts Colleges, University of Washington, April 6–7, 1965. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1965.

Crane, Robert I. "The Role of the Introductory Asia Course in Undergraduate Education." *Journal of General Education*, vol. XII, July 1959, pp. 164–69.

Creel, H. G. (ed.). *Chinese Civilization in Liberal Education.* Proceedings of a conference of specialists held at the University of Chicago in November 1958. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Danto, Arthur. "The Oriental Humanities and the Non-Orientalist." *Journal of General Education*, vol. XII, January 1959, pp. 15–21.

de Bary, William Theodore (ed.). *Approaches to the Oriental Classics: Asian Literature and Thought in General Education.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

———. "Asian Studies for Undergraduates: The Oriental Studies Program at Columbia College." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. XXX, January 1959, pp. 1–7.

———. *A Guide to Oriental Classics.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.

———. "Oriental Classics in General Education." *Journal of General Education*, vol. XII, January 1959, pp. 3–8.

de Bary, William Theodore, and Ainslie Embree (eds.). *Approaches to Asian Civilizations.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.

Dean, Vera Micheles. *The American Student and the Non-Western World.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

"Developing Cultural Understanding Through Foreign Language Study: A Report of the MLA Interdisciplinary Seminar in Language and Culture." *PMLA*, vol. LXVII, December 1953, pp. 1196–1218.

Ehrman, Edith (ed.). "Guide to Asian Studies in Undergraduate Education." *Newsletter* of the Association for Asian Studies, vol. 10, supplement No. 1, September 1964.

Fairbank, John King. "A Note of Ambiguity: Asian Studies in America." *Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. XIX, November 1959, pp. 3–9.

Gibb, Sir Hamilton. *Area Studies Reconsidered.* London: University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies, 1963.

Hall, Robert B. *Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences.* New York: Social Science Research Council, Pamphlet No. 3, 1947.

Hart, Henry C. *Campus India.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1961.

Herman, Theodore. "Colgate University." *Asian Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges*, edited by Ward Morehouse. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1961, pp. 19–24.

Hodgson, Marshall. "A Non-Western Civilization Course in a Liberal Education with Special Attention to the Case of Islam." *Journal of General Education*, vol. XII, January 1959, pp. 39–49.

Hurewitz, J. C. "Undergraduate Foreign Area Studies: The Case of the Middle East." *ACLS Newsletter*, vol. XV, April 1964, pp. 1–15.

Intercultural Education. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1965 (out of print).

Lambert, Richard D. (ed.) *Resources for South Asian Area Studies in the United States.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962.

Langlois, Walter G. "An Honors Program and the Growth of Asian Studies." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. XXXIII, May 1962, pp. 227–43.

Legters, Lyman H. *The National Defense Education Act and Latin American Studies.* Austin: Institute of Latin American Studies, University of Texas Press, 1964.

——— "NDEA Support for Undergraduate Language and Area Studies." *Liberal Education*, vol. LI, May 1965.

——— "The Overseas Dimension of the NDEA Language and Area Centers Program." *The Educational Record*, vol. 47, winter 1966, pp. 57–62.

Liu, James T. C. "An Orientation Course on Asian Civilizations." *Journal of General Education*, vol. X, October 1957, pp. 228–35.

Loh, Pichon P. Y. "Education Concerning Foreign Areas by Extracurricular Means." *The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana*, edited by Robert F. Byrnes. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, Slavic and East European Series, vol. XV, pp. 81–95.

Marriott, McKim. "An Indian Civilization Course." *The Teaching of Anthropology*, edited by David G. Mandelbaum, Gabriel W. Lasher and Ethel M. Albert. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963, pp. 203–216.

Morehouse, Ward. "Adding a New Dimension to Liberal Education." *Liberal Education*, vol. XLVI, October 1960, pp. 380–387.

——— "Asian Studies in Undergraduate Education." *Journal of General Education*, vol. XI, July 1958, pp. 125–140.

——— "Strengthening the Study of Neglected Cultures." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. XXXIV, June 1963, pp. 311–317.

——— "What Should Be the Role of Area Programs in the '60's?" *1960: Current Issues in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1960, pp. 190–193.

Morehouse, Ward (ed.). *Asian Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1961.

——— *Asian Studies in Undergraduate and Teacher Education.* New York: Conference on Asian Affairs, 1955.

——— *Foreign Area Studies and the College Library.* New York: Foreign Area Materials Center, University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Occasional Paper No. 1, 1965.

Morgenthau, Hans. "Area Studies and the Study of International Relations." *International Social Science Bulletin*, vol. IV, 1952, pp. 647–655.

Morse, Richard M. "The Challenge for Foreign Area Studies." *The Educational Record.* Special supplement on the Princeton University Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in the United States: A Guide for High School and College Programs, December 17–18, 1965. Spring 1966, pp. 234–243.

Murphy, Franklin D. "Languages and the National Interest." *PMLA*, vol. LXXV, May 1960, pp. 25–29.

Parker, William R. *The National Interest and Foreign Languages.* A discussion guide prepared for the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. Washington, D.C.: Department of State, 1961 (third edition).

——— "Why a Foreign Language Requirement?" *College and University*, vol. XXXII, Winter 1957, pp. 189–203.

"Princeton University Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in the United States: A Guide for High School and College Programs, December 17–18, 1965." A special supplement in *The Educational Record*, spring 1966, pp. 229–283.

Raushenbush, Esther. *The Fulbright Professor Meets the American College.* Report on the John Hay Whitney Foundation program in cooperation with the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, New York, 1962.

Reed, Howard A. "Intercultural or Non-Western Studies in General Education." *General Education: Current Ideas and Concerns*, edited by James G. Rice. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1964, pp. 51–60.

——— "Trends in Non-Western Studies in U.S. Liberal Arts Colleges." *1964: Current Issues in Higher Education*, Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1964 (reprint).

——— "Universalizing the Disciplines: Intercultural or Non-Western Studies in General Education." *AHE College & University Bulletin*, vol. 17, October 15, 1964, pp. 5–6.

Report of the Sub-Committee on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies. Sir William Hayter, Chairman. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1961.

Sayres, William C. *The Non-Western World in New York State Higher Education.* Albany, New York: State Education Department, 1961.

Shuster, George N. *Report to the Committee on Intercultural Studies in Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963.

Singer, Milton, et al. "Chicago's Non-Western Civilizations Program." *Journal of General Education*, vol. XII, January 1959, pp. 22–23.

——— (ed.) *Introducing India in Liberal Education.* Proceedings of a conference held at the University of Chicago in May 1957. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

——— "The Social Sciences in Non-Western Studies." The *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1964, pp. 30–44.

"The State University College at New Paltz, New York." *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1964, pp. 134–147.

A Survey of Asian Studies. A report prepared for the Ford Foundation in 1951 by a committee under the direction of Carl B. Spaeth.

Teng, S. Y. (ed.). *Asian Studies and State Universities.* Proceedings of a conference held at Indiana in November 1959. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1960.

Thompson, John M. "Among Indiana Colleges." *Asian Studies in Liberal Art Colleges*, edited by Ward Morehouse, Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1961, pp. 32–41.

Turner, Daymond. "New Graduate Programs in Modern Foreign Languages." *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. XXXVII, May 1966, pp. 241–45.

Undergraduate Instruction in Critical Languages and Area Studies. Recommendations and report of a conference held at Princeton University, October 12–13, 1964 (out of print).

Wagley, Charles. *Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas.* New York: Social Science Research Council, Pamphlet No. 6, 1948.

Weiner, Myron. "The Study of Indian Civilization at the University of Chicago: Needs and Choices." *Journal of General Education*, vol. XII, January 1959, pp. 24–8.

Yamagiwa, Joseph, *et al.* *A Survey of Intensive Programs in the Uncommon Languages Summer 1962.* Prepared for the U.S. Office of Education. Washington, D.C., 1962.

C. Library Resources

Harris, Chauncy D. "Area Studies and Library Resources." *The Library Quarterly*, vol. 35, October 1965, pp. 205–22.

Kublin, Hyman. "East Asian Studies and Library Resources: A Far Eastern Scholar Looks at the Library." *Foreign Area Studies and the College Library*, edited by Ward Morehouse. Occasional Publication No. 1. New York: Foreign Area Materials Center, State Education Department, University of the State of New York, 1965.

Morehouse, Ward (ed.). *Foreign Area Studies and the College Library.* Occasional Publication No. 1. New York: Foreign Area Materials Center, State Education Department, University of the State of New York, 1965.

Wagman, Frederick H. "The General Research Library and the Area Studies Program." *The Library Quarterly*, vol. 35, October 1965, pp. 343–355.

D. Teacher Training

Barker, H. Kenneth. "Teacher Education for International Goals." *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. XLVII, December 1965, pp. 220–227.

Education for International Understanding. Report on the AACTE-supported project at State University College, Plattsburg, N.Y., 1963.

Tewksbury, Donald G. "American Education and the International Scene." *Teachers College Record*, vol. LX, April 1959, pp. 357–368.

Welty, Paul S. "The World Challenge for Teacher Education." *Teacher Education: Direction for the Sixties.* Speech presented at the Tenth Biennial School for Executives, Bemidji State College, Bemidji, Minn., August 21–27, 1960, sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1961, pp. 77–82.

Wilson, Howard E. "International Affairs and the Education of American Teachers." *Teacher Education: Direction for the Sixties.* Speech presented at the Tenth Biennial School of Executives, Bemidji College, Bemidji, Minn., August 21–27, 1960, sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1961, pp. 65–76.

E. Research

Conflicts Between the Federal Research Programs and the Nation's Goals for Higher Education. Eighteenth report by the House Committee on Government Operations, 89th Congress, 1st session, Report No. 1158. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Horowitz, Irving Lewis. "The Life and Death of Project Camelot." *Trans-action*, vol. 3, November–December, 1965.

Nagle, William J. "Reflections After Three Years in the Foreign Affairs Contract Research World." Speech delivered at the International Studies Association Meeting, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich., May 5, 1966.

"The New Intelligence Requirements." Proceedings and Papers of the International Studies Association panel on the New Intelligence Requirements: The Roles of Government and the Academic Scholars, September 10, 1965. *Background—Journal of the International Studies Association*, vol. IX, November 1965 (entire issue).

Silvert, Kalman H. "American Academic Ethics and Social Research Abroad: The Lesson of Project Camelot." *American Universities Field Staff Report*, vol. 12, West Coast South America Series (entire issue).

Smuckler, Ralph H. "University Responsibilities and International Development Research." Speech presented at the American Council on Education meeting on University Goals and Responsibilities in Foreign Operations, May 12–13, 1965.

III. EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES

A. General

Bowles, Frank. *Access to Higher Education.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Committee on Educational Interchange Policy. *College and University Programs of Academic Exchange.* New York: Institue of International Education, March 1960.

——— *Educational Exchange in the Development of Nations.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1961.

——— *Women in Educational Exchange with the Developing Countries.* CEIP Statement No. 16. New York: Institute of International Education, 1963.

Cormack, Margaret L. *An Evaluation of Research on Educational Exchange.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, 1962.

Cotner, Thomas. *Evaluation of Educational Exchange Programs Now in Operation.* Report ACLS-22110. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963.

Davis, James M. "Some Trends in International Educational Exchange." *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 8, June 1964, pp. 48–57.

The Goals of Student Exchange. New York: Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, 1955.

Johnson, Walter and Francis J. Colligan. *The Fulbright Program: A History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Klineberg, Otto. "Research on International Exchanges in Education, Science and Culture." Paris: International Social Science Council, 1965.

Lundstedt, Sven (ed.). "Human Factors in Cross-Cultural Adjustment." *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 19, July 1963 (entire issue).

Melby, John F. (ed.). "The Rising Demand for International Education." The *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 335, May 1961 (entire issue).

Mestenhauser, Josef A. (ed.). *Research in Programs for Foreign Students: A Report of the Waldenwoods Seminar.* New York: National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, 1961.

Porter, Robert D. (ed.). *Selected Studies in Intercultural Education.* New York: National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, 1962.

Rosenzweig, Robert M. "Foreign Policy and Education: A Confusion of Purposes." A review essay of *The Fulbright Program: A History. The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. XXVII, May 1966, pp. 277–80.

Sharp, Paul F. "International Commitments of the American College." *Liberal Education*, Vol. 50, October 1964, pp. 321–327.

Smith, M. Brewster (ed.). "Attitudes and Adjustment on Cross-Cultural Contact: Recent Studies of Foreign Students." *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 12, 1956 (entire issue).

Teacher and Scholar Abroad: First-Person Reports of the U.S. Exchange Program. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, September 1964.

U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. *A Beacon of Hope: The Exchange of Persons Program.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

——— *A Sequel to a Beacon of Hope: The Exchange of Persons Program.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

Warmbrunn, Werner (ed.). *Research Studies in Intercultural Education: Reviews and Implications for Exchange of Persons.* New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1960.

B. Foreign Students

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers. *Guides to the Academic Placement of Students from Foreign Countries in Educational Institutions in the U.S.* Washington, D.C.: AACRAO. The pamphlet series, edited by William H. Strain, includes: Canada (1957), Germany (1957), Korea (1958), Thailand (1959), Austria (1961), Netherlands (1961), Mexico (1961), Venezuela (1961), Caribbean (1961), Afghanistan (1961), Tanganyika (1961), Rumania (1961), Hong Kong (1961), Philippines (1962), Argentina (1962), Italy (1962), United Kingdom (1963), France (1964), India (1964), Japan (1964), Switzerland (1964), Lebanon (1964).

Babbidge, Homer D., Jr. "Peace, Understanding and Education." Speech delivered at the 62d Annual Convention of the National Catholic Educational Association, April 20, 1965.

Barakat, Mohamed Khalifa, *et al. Studies on the Role as Culture Carriers of Eastern Students Who Received Their University Education in Western Countries: Report on the United Arab Republic's Study.* Paris: UNESCO, 1964 (UNESCO/SS/COM/6).

Beals, Ralph L. and Norman D. Humphrey. *No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957.

Bennett, John W., Robert K. McKnight and Herbert Passin. *In Search of Identity.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958.

Coelho, George V. *Changing Images of America; A Study of Indian Students' Perceptions.* Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958.

——— (ed.). "Impacts of Studying Abroad." *Journal of Social Issues,* vol. 18, 1962 (entire issue).

Committee on Educational Interchange Policy. *The Foreign Student: Exchangee or Immigrant?* New York: Institute of International Education, 1958.

——— *A Foreign Student Program for the Developing Countries during the Coming Decade.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1962.

——— *The Goals of Student Exchange: An Analysis of Goals of Programs for Foreign Students.* New York: CEIP, January 1955.

——— *Orientation of Foreign Students: Signposts for the Cultural Maze.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1965.

Committee on the Foreign Student in American Colleges and Universities. *The College, the University and the Foreign Student.* New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1963.

Davis, James M. "The Most Effective and Helpful Means of Educating and Dealing With the Increasing Number of Foreign Students Attending American Colleges and Universities." Paper presented at the 16th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, March 7, 1961.

Du Bois, Cora. *Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United United States.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956.

The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome? New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964.

Fox, Melvin J. "Foreign Students in American Colleges." *College Board Review,* Winter 1962. Also a Ford Foundation reprint.

Grubel, Herbert G. "Nonreturning Foreign Students and the Cost of Student Exchange." *International Educational and Cultural Exchange,* spring 1966, pp. 20–29.

Guidelines: English Language Proficiency. Field Service Publication G–3. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, November 1965.

Guidelines: Initial Orientation of Foreign Students. Field Service Publication G–4. New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, September 1964.

Guidelines: Interpretation of the U.S. to the Foreign Student. Field Service Publication G–8. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, October 1965.

Guidelines: Responsibilities and Standards in Work with Foreign Students. Field Service Publication G–1. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, September 1964.

Guidelines: Selection and Admission of Foreign Students. Field Service Publication G–2. New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, March 1965.

Harari, Maurice. "American Higher Education and the Foreign Student: Laissez-Faire Versus Planning." Speech delivered at the annual conferance of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Philadelphia, April 29, 1965.

Henderson, Gregory. "Foreign Students: Exchange or Immigration?" *NAFSA Newsletter,* vol. XVI, November 15, 1964, pp. 1–4.

Higbee, Homer. *The Status of Foreign Student Advising in United States Universities and Colleges.* East Lansing, Mich. Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1961.

IIE Survey of the African Student: His Achievements and His Problems. Institute of International Education, 1961.

The International Study of University Admissions: Access to Higher Education. National Studies, vol. II. Paris: UNESCO and the International Association of Universities, 1965.

Jacqz, Jane (ed.). *Guidelines for the Admission and Placement of Students from the Middle East and North Africa.* New York: American Association on Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the Institute of International Education, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, and the College Entrance Examination Board, July 1966.

——— *Guidelines for the Admission and Placement of Students from Taiwan and Hong Kong.* New York: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the Institute of International Education, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, and the College Entrance Examination Board, July 1966.

Jones, Thomas F. "Should the Foreign Engineering Student Return to His Native Land to Practice His Profession?" Memorandum to members of Education and World Affairs Study Committee, June 1966.

Kuppusamy, B. *Studies on the Role as Culture Carriers of Eastern Students Who Received Their University Education in Western Countries: Report on the Indian Study.* Paris: UNESCO, 1964 (UNESCO/SS/COM/7).

Lambert, Richard D. (e.). "America Through Foreign Eyes." The *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 295, September 1954 (entire issue).

——— and Marvin Bressler. *Indian Students on an American Campus.* Mineapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Melby, John F. "The Foreign Student in America." *Orbis,* vol. VIII, spring 1964.

Moore, Forrest G. "Follow-Up: Feasibility or Fantasy?" *American Alumni Council News,* vol. XXVII, May 1960, pp. 2–5.

——— and Robert E. Forman. *The University and Its Foreign Alumni: Maintaining Overseas Contacts.* Minnesota Studies in Student Personnel Work, No. 13, edited by E. G. Williamson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1964.

Morehouse, Ward. "Provincialism and Constitutionalism: The Role of the States in Foreign Area Studies." The *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 356, November 1964, pp. 119–125.

Morris, Richard T. *The Two-Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Students' Adjustment.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

The Overseas Selection of Foreign Students. New York: Education and World Affairs, April 1966.

Peisch, Mark L. *The Foreign Graduate Student at Twenty-two American Universities: Admissions and Financial Aid.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board and Institute of International Education, March 1965.

Putman, Ivan, Jr. *The Foreign Student Adviser and His Institution in International Student Exchange* Handbook for Foreign Student Advisers, part I. New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1965.

"Reporter at Large: Something To Take Back Home." *New Yorker Magazine*, May 23, 1964.

Ruedisili, Chester H. and Harry Sharp. *Survey of Foreign Students at the University of Wisconsin and Also of Foreign Alumni Who Have Returned to Their Home Countries.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965.

Sanders, Irwin T. *The Professional Education of Students from Other Lands.* New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1963.

Sasnett, Martena Tenney (ed.). *A Guide to the Admission and Placement of Foreign Students.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1962.

Selltiz, Claire, Stuart W. Cook and June R. Christ. *Attitudes and Social Relations of Foreign Students.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.

Simmerville, Clara. "The Foreign Student in Your Classroom: A Critical Opportunity." Corvallis: Oregon State Board of Higher Education, Oregon State University, 1965.

Strain, William H. "Which Foreign Students Should U.S. Institutions Admit?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 46, March 1965, pp. 332–335.

U.S. College and University Policies, Practices and Problems in Admitting Foreign Students. New York: Institute of International Education, 1965.

Useem, John and Ruth Hill Useem. *The Western Educated Man in India.* New York: Dryden Press. 1955.

William, Davis B. *Development of Effective Academic Programs for Foreign Students: Curricular, Work Experience, and Social Aspects.* Cornell International Agricultural Development Mimeograph 5. Ithaca: Cornell University, n.d.

Wilcox, Lee (ed.). *Evaluation of Asian Student Credentials: A Workshop Report (India, Japan, the Philippines, and Taiwan).* National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, April 1966.

Women in Educational Exchange with the Developing Countries. New York: Institute of International Education, 1963.

C. U.S. Students Abroad

Abrams, Irwin. "The Student Abroad." *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments*, edited by Samuel Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965, pp. 78–102.

——— *Study Abroad.* New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 6, edited by W. R. Hatch. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1960.

Academic Programs Abroad: An Exploration of Their Assets and Liabilities. Report of a special conference at Mount Holyoke College in January 1960, sponsored by the Association of American Colleges, the Council on Student Travel, the Experiment in International Living and the Institute of International Education. New York: Institute of International Education, 1960.

American Students Abroad: Goodwill Ambassadors? Syracuse: University of Syracuse, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and national Education, 1958.

Cheadle, Dr. Vernon I. Remarks made at meeting on student exchange, Tokyo, August 30, 1965 (mimeo).

Foreign Study for U.S. Undergraduates. New York: Institute of International Education, 1958.

Freeman, Stephen A. *Undergraduate Study Abroad: U.S. College-Sponsored Programs.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1966 (second edition).

Garraty, John A. and Walter Adams. *A Guide to Study Abroad.* Manhasset, New York: Channel Press, 1962.

Gould, Samuel B. "The University's Stake in Educaitonal Travel." *The American Student Abroad 1956–57.* New York: Council on Student Travel, 1958, pp. 5–7.

A Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad. New York: Council on Student Travel, 1965.

Johnson, Walter. *American Studies Abroad: Progress and Difficulties in Selected Countries.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, 1963.

Maza, Herbert. "American Student Abroad: A Proposal for Standards." *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. XLVII, January 1963.

Programs for United States Undergraduates in Other Countries: A Survey of Present and Proposed Programs. New York: Institute of International Education, 1960.

Shank, Donald J. "The American Goes Abroad." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 335, May 1961, pp. 99–111.

——— "Junior Year Abroad: A Critical Look." *Institute of International Education News Bulletin*, vol. 36, October 1960, pp. 11–19.

——— Stephen A. Freeman, David Wodlinger, Anne G. Pannell, and William Allaway. "Opportunities and Problems Involved in the Study Abroad of U.S. Students." *College and University*, summer 1963, pp. 434–460.

Transplanted Students: A Report of the National Conference on Undergraduate Study Abroad, held in Chicago, October 1960, under the sponsorship of the Association of American Colleges, the Council on Student Travel, the Experiment in International Living and the Institute of International Education. New York: Institute of International Education, June 1961.

"Young Americans Abroad." *Carnegie Corporation of New York Quarterly*, vol. IX, January 1961, pp. 1–5.

D. Faculty and Scholar Exchange

Committee on Educational Interchange Policy. *Foreign Professors and Research Scholars at U.S. Colleges and Universities.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1963.

Garraty, John A. and Walter Adam. *From Main Street to the Left Bank.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1959.

Goodwin, Leonard. *American Professors in Asia: A Study of the Selection and Adaptation of Fifty American Professors Who Went to India, Pakistan and Korea Under the Fulbright-Hays Program During 1962–63.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, June 1964.

Guidelines for Policies on Leaves from Colleges and Universities for Service Outside the USA. Bloomington, Ind.: Commission on International Relations in Education, Phi Delta Kappa, 1964.

Raushenbush, Esther. *The Fulbright Professor Meets the American College.* New York: John Hay Whitney Foundation, 1962.

Teacher Exchange Opportunities. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (annual).

IV. U.S. OVERSEAS ACTIVITIES

A. Role of Education in Developing Countries

Ashby, Eric. *African Universities and Western Tradition.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

——— *Universities for Export: Agenda for Some Thinking.* n.d. (mimeo).

——— Untitled speech delivered at Cornell centennial convocation, October 9, 1964.

Baumgartner, Leona. "The National Commitment to Developing Nations and the Universities." Speech presented to the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., October 3, 1963.

Cerych, Ladislav. *Educational Aid to Developing Countries.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger (for the Atlantic Institute), 1965.

Cleveland, Harlan, Gerard J. Mangone and John Clarke Adams. *The Overseas Americans.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Conference on the African University and National Educational Development. New York: Institute for Education in Africa, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Curle, Adam. *Educational Strategy for Developing Societies.* London: Tavistock, 1963.

——— "The Role of Education in Developing Societies." An inaugural lecture delivered in the University College of Ghana, February 15, 1961.

Eberly, Donald J. "The American Contribution to West African Education." *West African Journal of Education*, June 1962, pp. 49–52.

Enarson, Harold L. "The United States Commitment to Education in Developing Societies." *The National Elementary Principal*, vol. XLIV, February 1965, pp. 12–19.

Everton, John Scott. "America's Response to Educational Problems in Developing Nations." Speech delivered at the Duke University Conference on Christianity and Social Revolution in Newly Developing Nations, April 11, 1964.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. "A Positive Approach to Economic Aid." *Foreigh Affairs*, vol. XLIX, April 1961, pp. 444–457.

Harbison, Frederick. "Education for Development." *Scientific American*, vol. 209, September 1963, pp. 140–147.

——— "Problems of Developing Higher Education in the Newly Developing Countries." *Education and the Modernizing of Nations*, edited by Elizabeth N. Shiver. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

——— and Charles A. Myers. *Education, Manpower and Economic Growth.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Kilson, Martin L., Jr. "Trends in Higher Education." *Africa and the United States: Images and Realities*, Eighth National Conference, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Boston, October 22–26, 1961, p. 71.

LaPalombara, Joseph. "American Higher Education and Political Development." *Post-Primary Education and Political and Economic Development*, edited by Don C. Piper and Taylor Cole. Durham: Duke University Press, 1964, pp. 95–127.

Manpower Needs and Educational Capabilities—Ethiopia, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda: Summary Report. John Masland, study director. New York: Education and World Affairs, April 16, 1965 (mimeo—limited distribution).

Marvel, William W. "The Place of Education and Human Resources Development in Foreign Assistance." Report on a conference organized by the Carnegie Corporation and held at Williamsburg, Virginia, April 8–10, 1962.

National Development and the University. New York: Council on Higher Education in the American Republics, Institute of International Education, 1965.

Perkins, James. "Foreign Aid and the Brain Drain." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. XLIV, July 1966, pp. 608–619.

Shiver, Elizabeth N. (ed.). *Education and the Modernizing of Nations.* Summary proceedings of a conference sponsored by the Commission of International Education of the American Council on Education and Wayne State University, September 1964. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964.

Snyder, Kenneth C. "Africa's Challenge to American Higher Education." *Higher Education*, vol. XIX, June 1963, pp. 7–19.

Thurber, Clarence E. and Edward W. Weidner. *Technical Assistance in Training Administrators: Lessons from the American Experience.* Selected Papers on Public Administration No. 2. Bloomington: Institute of Training for Public Service, Department of Government, Indiana University.

B. Role of University in Technical Assistance

(1) General

Adams, Richard N., and Charles C. Cumberland. *United States University Cooperation in Latin America.* East Lansing: The Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1960.

Adams, Walter and John A. Garraty. *Is the World Our Campus?* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1960.

Bell, David E. "The University Contribution to the Developing Nations." Address delivered at the regional conference of Education and World Affairs, East Lansing, Mich., October 11, 1963.

——— "The Quality of Aid." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. XLIV, July 1966, pp. 602–607.

Bronfenbrenner, Martin. *Academic Encounter: The American University in Japan and Korea.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1961.

Butts, R. Freeman. *American Education in International Development.* New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Byrnes, Francis C. *Americans in Technical Assistance: A Study of Attitudes and Responses to Their Role Abroad.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965.

Coombs, Philip H. "Ways To Improve United States Foreign Education Aid." *Education and Foreign Aid* by Philip H. Coombs and Karl W. Bigelow. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Enarson, Harold L. "The Universities' Stake in the Developing Nations" *Educational Record*, vol. 45; Winter 1964, pp. 27–32.

Esman, Milton J. *Needed: An Education and Research Base to Support America's Expanded Commitments Overseas.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961.

Guthrie, George M. and Richard E. Spencer. *American Professions and Overseas Technical Assistance.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1965.

——— and Clarence Thurber. *The Professional Roles of Americans Overseas.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1964.

Morison, Robert S. "The University and Technical Assistance." *Daedalus*, vol. 91, spring 1962, pp. 319–340.

Proceedings of the Conference on International Development. Sponsored by the Agency for International Development, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington: Agency for International Development, 1964.

Riggs, Fred W. "Memorandum on Foreign Aid, Political Development, and the International Role of Universities and Professional Societies." Comments in answer to a questionnaire distributed by F. Bradford Morse, Member of Congress from Massachusetts, on behalf of a group of Republican Congressmen conducting a review of U.S. foreign aid programs [1966?] (mimeo).

Robinson, Mary E. *Education for Social Change: Establishing Institutes of Public and Business Administration Abroad.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1961.

Sanders, Irwin T. "American Professionals Overseas: Academic Specialists' Views of Themselves and Their Roles in Technical Assistance Programs." Adapted from three papers by the author. New York: Ford Foundation, 1966 (reprint).

Smith, Bruce L. *Indonesian-American Cooperation in Higher Education.* East Lansing: The Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1960.

Special Policy Committee on Technical Cooperation. *The Role of Universities in Technical Cooperation.* Washington, D.C.: National Planning Association, 1955.

Stassen, Harold E. "Technical Service Overseas," *Proceedings.* Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 1953, pp. 52–57.

Williams, G. Mennen. "The Role of American Higher Education in Developing African Nations." *Proceedings.* American Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1961, p. 22.

(2) AID Contracts

Caldwell, Lynton K. "The Universities and International Technical Assistance: The Uses of Government Contracts." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 36, May 1965, pp. 266–273.

Gardner, John W. *AID and the Universities.* New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964.

McCamy, James L. *Conduct of the New Diplomacy.* New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Rosenzweig, Robert M. "Universities and the Foreign Assistance Program: Guarding the Integrity of the Educational Enterprise." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 35, October 1964, pp. 359–366.

The Scholar and the Policy Maker. A series of talks given at the plenary session of the Association for Asian Studies, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 20, 1964. Washington, D.C.: External Research Paper 151, Department of State, 1964.

Training for Leadership and Service: Proceedings of the National Conference on the International Training Programs of AID, June 25–26, 1962. Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development, 1962 (out of print).

(3) Peace Corps

Iversen, Robert W. "Peace Corps Training: Lessons of the First Year." *The Educational Record*, vol. XLIV, January 1963, pp. 17–25.

Pagano, Jules. *Education in the Peace Corps: Evolving Concepts of Volunteer Training.* Brookline, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Boston University, 1965.

Parmer, J. Norman (ed.). "The Peace Corps." The *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 365, May 1966.

Shriver, Sargent. "Two Years of the Peace Corps." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 41, July 1963, pp. 694–707.

Wofford, Harris L. "A New Education Program for the Peace Corps." *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, winter 1966, pp. 49–53.

V. COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS

Anderson, Wayne W. *Cooperation Within American Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1964.

Bunnell, Kevin P. and Eldon L. Johnson. "Interinstitutional Cooperation." *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments*, edited by Samuel Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965, pp. 246–271.

"Cooperative Relations in Higher Education." *School and Society*, vol. 94, April 16–30, 1966 (entire issue).

Dangerfield, Royden. "The Consortium Approach." Paper presented at conference on U.S. University Involvement in Latin American Institutional Development, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., May 1–4, 1966.

Donovan, George F. (ed.). *College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation.* Proceedings of the Workshop on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Catholic University of America, June 1964. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

Fraser, Stewart E. "Some Aspects of University Cooperation in International Education." *School and Society*, April 16–30, 1966, pp. 234–244.

Johnson, Eldon L. "College Federations: Requisites of Success." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. XXXVII, January 1966, pp. 1–9.

Peretz, Don. "Cooperative Faculty Seminar in Far Eastern Art and Culture." *Liberal Education*, vol. LI, December 1965.

Witman, Shepherd. "Cooperation for International Education." *International Education and Cultural Exchange*, Fall 1965, pp. 56–61.

VI. RESOURCE MATERIALS

A. Reference Works

The Asia Society (comp.). *American Institutions and Organizations Interested in Asia, a Reference Directory;* edited by Ward Morehouse. New York: Taplinger, 1961 (second edition).

The Associated Colleges of the Midwest. Annual report. Newberry Library, Chicago, Ill.

The Committee on Institutional Cooperation. Annual report. West Lafayette, Ind.

Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. *Resources Survey for Latin American Countries.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, November 1965.

Educational Planning: A Directory of Training and Research Institutions. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, 1964.

Great Lakes Colleges Association. Annual report. Detroit Metropolitan Airport, Detroit, Mich.

Handbook on International Study: For Foreign Nationals. New York: Institute of International Education, 1965.

Handbook on International Study: For U.S. Nationals, New York: Institute of International Education, 1965.

The International Programs of American Universities. Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1958. Revised edition, prepared by the Institute of Advanced Projects of the East-West Center, Margaret Cormack (comp.), to be published by Michigan State University Office of International Programs, fall 1966.

Inventory of Training Possibilities in Europe. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1965.

Language and Area Study Programs in American Universities. Washington, D.C.: Department of State, 1964.

Lowenstein, Linda (comp.). *Government Resources Available for Foreign Affairs Research.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, 1965.

Mithun, Jacqueline S. (comp.). *African Programs of U.S. Organizations: A Selective Directory.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, 1965.

Open Doors. New York: Institute of International Education (annual).

Overseas Programs of Private Nonprofit American Organizations. Report No. 3 on Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, pursuant to H. Res. 84. 89th Congress, 1st session. Union Calendar No. 178. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Research Centers on the Developing Areas. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, November 1964.

Research in International Education: Research in Progress and Research Recently Completed. New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and the Institute of International Education (annual).

Some U.S. Government Agencies Engaged in International Activities. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, November 1963.

Study Abroad. Paris: UNESCO (annual).

"*Summer Study Abroad.*" New York: Institute of International Education (annual).

Teaching Abroad. Paris: UNESCO (annual).

UNESCO Handbook of International Exchanges. Paris: UNESCO, 1965.

U.S. Non-Profit Organizations—Voluntary Agencies, Missions and Foundations—Participating in Technical Assistance Abroad: a Directory, 1964 and *Supplement, 1965.* New York: Technical Assistance Information Clearing House, 1964 and 1965.

Wasson, Donald (comp.). *American Agencies Interested in International Affairs.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger (for the Council on Foreign Relations), 1964 (fifth edition).

Work, Study, Travel Abroad: A Reference for Students. New York: U.S. National Student Association (annual).

B. Bibliographies

Bereday, George Z. F. and Lauwerys, Joseph A. (eds.). "*Education and International Life: The Year Book of Education 1964.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.

Conover, Helen (ed.). *Africa South of the Sahara: A Selected Annotated List of Writings.* Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1964.

Crabbs, Richard F. and Frank W. Holmquist (eds.). *United States Higher Education and World Affairs: A Partially Annotated Bibliography.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger (to be published).

Cross-Cultural Education: A Bibliography of Government-Sponsored and Private Research on Foreign Students and Trainees in the U.S. and in Other Countries, 1946–1964. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, April 1965.

Davis, Russell G. (ed.). *Education, Spanish America: An Annotated Bibliography.* Handbook of Latin American Studies, No. 25. Washington, D.C.: Hispanic Foundation, Library of Congress, 1965.

Educational Planning: a Bibliography. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, 1964.

Eells, Walter Crosby (ed.). *American Dissertations on Foreign Education.* Washington, D.C.: Committee on International Relations, National Education Association, 1959.

Elliott, Alan J. A. "Cultural Relations as a Field for Study and Research." *International Social Science Journal*, vol. XVII, 1965, pp. 657–664.

International Educational and Cultural Exchange: A Selective Bibliography of Materials on Both Governmental and Private Programs. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, June 1963.

Katz, Joseph. *Readings on International Understanding: A Selected List for Curriculum Workers.* Bloomington, Ind.: Commission on International Relations in Education, Phi Delta Kappa, 1964.

A Select Bibliography: Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe Latin America. New York: American Universities Field Staff, 1960. *Supplements*, 1961, 1963, 1965.

The Social Sciences in Foreign Policy: Documents on Government Support of Foreign Affairs Research. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State [1966].

○